



Paper: “Causes et conséquences de la fluctuation du prix de l’huile de palme dans les marchés d’Edéa-Cameroun”

Submitted: 20 August 2025

Accepted: 29 September 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Eleazar Tchemtchoua

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n28p87

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bourema Kone
IER, Mali

Reviewer 2: Sana Ibrahim
University of Parakou, Bénin

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!

Reviewer Name: Bouréma KONE	
University/Country: IER, Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/08/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/09/2025
Manuscript Title: Causes et conséquences de la fluctuation du prix de l'huile de palme dans les marchés d'Edéa – Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0913/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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: yes	

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. (Please insert your comments) Le titre est bien formulé et correspond au contenu du document	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Le document est bien résumé et comprend l'objectif, la méthodologie et les résultats	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Cet article Contient moins de fautes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	

La méthodologie n'est pas bien expliquée, il manque les type de données collecté (mensuelle ou hebdomadaire.....). Le choix des producteurs, transformateurs et des commerçants n'est pas bien expliqué. Le modelé d'analyse utilisé pour la saisonnalité n'est pas pertinent. Il est basé sur la déclaration des auteurs. Le choix de la classification sur la base du revenu. La taille de l'échantillon pour les producteurs est petite. Pour quoi 40 producteurs suelement	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
« augmentation des températures engendre une diminution du prix moyen de l'huile de palme (figure 2) ; de même les prix moyens de l'huile de palme et les précipitations ont une forte corrélation positive ($r=0,573>0$) et statistiquement significative ($p=0,051>5\%$), ce qui envisage qu'une augmentation des températures engendre une diminution du prix moyen de l'huile de palme » Vous ne dites pas le pourquoi de ca. Vous faites une analyse sur la variation du prix en fonction des précipitations mais on ne retrouve pas la figure. « Le test de corrélation de Pearson a révélé une corrélation faible et non significative ($r = -0,15$, $p = 0,35 > 0,05$) entre le coût de production et le prix de vente, indiquant que le coût de production avait peu d'influence sur le prix pour les producteurs. » Donner le pourquoi de cette affirmation	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>C'est coherent</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Les références sont claires et appropriées</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il serait nécessaire de revoir la taille de l'échantillon des producteurs et intégrer dans votre analyses la série des prix hebdomadaire ou mensuel pour la variabilité saisonnière

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name: SANA Ibrahim	
University/Country: University of Parakou, Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: August 27	Date Review Report Submitted: September 9
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Causes et consequences de la fluctuation du prix de l'huile de palm dans les marchés d'Edéa-Cameroun	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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: Yes	

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.	3
Because your method of analysis and your results deal more with perceptions sert your comments)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
Much of your summary presents the results of your research, but you say nothing about the implications of your research. You will need to expand on the last paragraph about the implications of the research. .	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
To be reviewed: there are many grammatical, spelling, and especially syntax errors. A thorough proofreading is required. nts)	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The method used is clear but very simple. Consider using a model if your data allows it</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The way the results are presented is problematic. The results are repeated excessively in the discussion and conclusion sections. In addition, the results mostly deal with perceptions, so it is not appropriate to draw conclusions based on perceptions unless you indicate that your study deals with perceptions.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>To be taken seriously. Here you have only summarized the results and discussion section</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>To be reviewed Out of 25 references, more than 10 (highlighted in yellow) are technical reports. Use more academic references for greater scientific reliability.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Overall, the work is interesting, but there are several things that need to be reviewed.

- Reread the text carefully and use an appropriate academic style.
- Add the implications of the study in the summary and conclusion sections.
- When reading your manuscript, the originality of the study is not apparent.
- Add a theoretical framework and use an economic theory to contextualize the study.
- Consider the possibility of estimating your data using an econometric model.
- The discussion and conclusion sections need to be rewritten.
- Make greater use of scientific academic references in your study.
- The introduction lacks hypotheses.

A theoretical framework is needed for this type of research.

I invite you to explore the following theories:

- - the theory of supply and demand,
- - the theory of agricultural volatility,
- - the theory of price transmission and information asymmetries.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: RAS