



Paper: "Effect of the Energy Transition on Food Security: The Role of the Female Agricultural Workforce in WAEMU Countries"

Submitted: 07 November 2025

Accepted: 27 December 2025

Published: 31 December 2025

Corresponding Author: Kouame Kouakou Romaric

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2025.v21n34p186

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enriko Ceko
Wisdom University, Albania

Reviewer 2: Uchenna J. Okefi
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, USA

Reviewer 3: Oumar Bah
Sup' Management, Mali

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: Enriko Ceko	
University/Country: Canadian Institute of Technology, Tirana, Albania.	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 th November 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 th November 2025
Manuscript Title: Effect of the Energy Transition on Food Security : The Role of the Female Agricultural Workforce in WAEMU Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1144/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OK	
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: OK	

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. <i>Good. It can be shorter</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>It is a good one. But a more shorter sentences and emphasis a bit more implications.</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>There are multiple errors. Shortening sentences and paragraphs helps on fixing grammar issues too.</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>Detailed methodology.</i>	4

PMG-ARDL model is well presented. Econometric tests (unit root, cross-sectional dependence, cointegration) are chosen appropriately. Some equations are not displayed but are referenced. Ensure all equations are properly numbered and formatted.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Well structured results. Informative tables. Coherent interpretations. Some coefficients need clearer economic interpretation. Link results to existing literature will improve this part of paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Accurate.</i> <i>Informative.</i> <i>Well dressed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Good.</i> <i>Should be formatted as per the requests of the Journal.</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):

- Improve the English sentence structure, punctuation, and transitions.
- Ensure equations referenced are fully presented and correctly numbered.
- Strengthen the discussion – compare your findings with earlier studies using similar models or regional contexts.
- In the short-term section - clarify economic interpretation of AOI and rainfall effects, and some other indicators).
- Simplify - reorganize Section 1 of the introduction (avoid long paragraphs).
- Review tables for formatting and variable naming.
- Ensure uniform referencing style across the entire bibliography.

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: Uchenna J. Okefi	
University/Country: North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University/USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/14/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/02/2025
Manuscript Title: Effect of the Energy Transition on Food Security: The Role of the Female Agricultural Workforce in WAEMU Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: Yes.	
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. The title is clear. However, the author should state which countries are included in WAEMU, use the abbreviation in parentheses, and write out the ARDL model in full, also using the acronym in parentheses, in the abstract.	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. The abstract presented the objectives, methods, and results.	5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

The level of English and the style were fine. No errors or typos were detected. However, several improper spacing issues need adjustment. Every chapter of this paper needs to be reedited for incorrect, lack of, and/or inappropriate use of punctuation marks.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Yes, the methods are clear.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear and error-free.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes, this chapter is clear.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references are comprehensive and appropriate. However, I recommend incorporating newer/recent articles on similar studies in the citations/references. In addition, the reference has different font sizes. This needs to be adjusted.	

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):

The manuscript presents valuable insights into women's involvement in the energy transition and sustainable food security in WAEMU countries. However, a few points can be addressed to strengthen the manuscript.

- The introduction of this paper cited few and little peer-reviewed citations. It would be beneficial to include a substantial amount of recent peer-reviewed citations and references in this study.
- Detailed and careful editing for line spacing and punctuation marks is highly recommended for the entire paper.
- Incorporate more recent citations and adjust the reference font sizes.

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: Dr Oumar BAH - Maitre-Assistant du CAMES	
University/Country: Sup'Management - Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/12/2025
Manuscript Title: Effect of the Energy Transition on Food Security : The Role of the Female Agricultural Workforce in WAEMU Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1144/25	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>The title is clear and consistent with the content of the article.</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>The objectives, methodology and results are presented in the article.</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>There are not many spelling mistakes in the document.</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>The methodology is clearly presented in the article.</i>	4

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results of the study are well presented and contain no errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion and summary are tailored to the content of the article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The bibliographical references are tailored to the content of the article.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ may edit this article.