



Paper: “Evaluation de la rentabilité de la production de la banane plantain dans le village Mansende au Kongo central en République Démocratique du Congo”

Submitted: 15 May 2025

Accepted: 10 July 2025

Published: 31 July 2025

Corresponding Author: Mireille Kimanda Asha

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n19p198

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Manu Ibrahim

University of Dschang, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Moïse Lufuluabo Mwabila

Université Pédagogique Nationale, RD Congo

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 21 juin 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 04 juillet 2025
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la rentabilité de la production de la banane plantain dans le village Mansende au Kongo central en République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0603/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OUI	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Oui	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le texte est en effet en lien avec le titre	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est bien rédigé	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'article contient très peu de fautes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

La méthodologie pose problème: - L'échantillonnage n'a pas expliquée - la rentabilité est quantitatives et se calcule. On ne peut pas le prendre pour une variable dépendante binaire, et donc pas de modèle logit pour les analyses - La fonction logit n'est pas présentée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Plensert your comments)</i> Il y a des tableaux mal présentés, ils comportent beaucoup de vides. Déséquilibre dans la distribution des modalités. Dans un tableau, l'âge a été croisé à d'autres variables, sans qu'elle ne soit la variable dépendante.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(L insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion est bien faite, mais il y a des corrections à faire avant tout</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La bibliographie est bien présentée</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Je suggère que les auteurs intègrent les remarques et refasse les analyses avec un autre modèle que celui-ci.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: