



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Transition vers les énergies renouvelables en bien-être des ménages ruraux : Une analyse empirique au Bénin”

Submitted: 30 November 2025

Accepted: 13 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Jiles Nounassou HOUNGBO

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n2p163

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Bah
Sup' Management, Mali

Reviewer 2: Aicha El Alaoui
Sultan My Slimane University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Toure Krouele
Ecole Normale Supérieure d'Abidjan, Ivory Coast

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: Aicha EL ALAOUI	
University/Country: Faculty of Economic and Management, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: Dec 20, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: Dec 21, 2025
Manuscript Title: Transition to Renewable Energy and Rural Household Well-being: An Empirical Analysis in Benin Transition vers les Énergies Renouvelables et Bien-être des Ménages Ruraux : Une Analyse Empirique au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1231/25	
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: 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.	4
<i>The title is clear, precise, and fully consistent with the content of the article. It explicitly identifies the key elements of the study: the energy transition (renewable/solar energy), rural household well-being, the empirical nature of the analysis, and the geographical focus (Benin). The bilingual presentation (English and French) is appropriate for an international journal and enhances accessibility. The title accurately reflects both the socioeconomic and environmental dimensions analyzed in the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4

<i>The abstract is well structured and comprehensive. It clearly states the research problem (energy poverty), the study area (Atacora, Benin), the sample size (300 households), and the methodological approach. The main results are explicitly presented, highlighting the positive impacts of solar energy adoption on income, financial stability, poverty reduction, food consumption, and environmental quality. The abstract is concise yet informative and aligns well with the body of the paper.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>While the overall language level is acceptable and the article remains understandable, there are several grammatical, syntactic, and typographical errors. Some inconsistencies in terminology, punctuation, and sentence structure are noticeable. In addition, minor formatting issues appear in tables (decimal separators, alignment, and wording such as “Std. Se tromper.”), see tableau 1. A careful linguistic proofreading by a native speaker or professional editor or rereading of manuscript is recommended to improve clarity and readability.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The methodology is generally well explained and grounded in relevant theoretical and econometric frameworks (random utility theory, probit model, propensity score matching, and double selection). The sampling strategy, data collection process, and econometric techniques are clearly described. However, the section could benefit from greater conciseness and clearer sub-structuring. Additionally, some methodological choices (e.g., variable selection, robustness checks, and limitations of perception-based environmental measures) could be explained more explicitly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are presented in a clear and logical manner, supported by well-organized tables and a consistent narrative. The findings are coherent across different estimation techniques (probit, PSM, double selection), which strengthens their credibility. However, minor issues remain, such as occasional inconsistencies in units (e.g., “centaines de milliers de FCFA”) and some typographical errors in tables. Clarifying these aspects would further improve the precision and transparency of the results.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions accurately reflect the empirical findings and are well supported by the results presented in the paper. They synthesize the main contributions regarding household well-being and environmental quality without overstating the outcomes. The policy implications are relevant and logically derived from the analysis, particularly concerning public support, subsidies, and incentives for solar energy adoption. The conclusion effectively highlights the contribution of renewable energy to sustainable and inclusive development.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The reference list is extensive, up-to-date, and highly relevant. It includes a balanced mix of theoretical works, empirical studies, and policy-oriented reports from reputable sources (World Bank, IEA, peer-reviewed journals). The citations are well integrated into the text and demonstrate strong engagement with the literature on energy transition, rural electrification, and household welfare. Overall, the references adequately support the theoretical framework, methodology, and discussion.</i>	

However, a minor issue concerns the consistency between in-text citations and the reference list. Some works cited in the manuscript are missing from the reference list, while a few references listed are not explicitly cited in the text. The authors are kindly requested to ensure full consistency by adding the missing references and either citing or removing those not used in the manuscript. This is a formal correction and does not affect the scientific quality of the paper.

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 a rigorous and well-structured empirical analysis of the impact of renewable energy -specifically solar energy adoption- on rural household wellbeing and environmental quality in Benin. The research question is relevant, timely, and clearly articulated. The methodological framework is sound, combining probit models, propensity score matching, and double-selection approaches, which strengthens the robustness of the results. The findings are coherent, well interpreted, and well supported by the existing literature.

The main contribution of the paper lies in its micro-level empirical evidence on the socioeconomic and environmental benefits of solar energy adoption in a West African rural context, an area where empirical studies remain limited. The policy implications are clearly drawn and relevant for decision-makers involved in energy transition and rural development. Minor revisions are nevertheless recommended. These concern mainly language and presentation issues, including grammatical and typographical errors, minor inconsistencies in tables (units, labels, and formatting), and some repetition in the methodology section. A careful linguistic proofreading and slight restructuring for conciseness would significantly improve the overall clarity and readability of the manuscript, without affecting its scientific content.

Overall, the paper is of good quality and suitable for publication after minor revisions.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 30-12-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 09-01-2026
Manuscript Title: Transition vers les Énergies Renouvelables et Bien-être des Ménages Ruraux : Une Analyse Empirique au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31-12-2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NON	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: OUI	
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. (Please insert your comments) L’auteur parle des énergies renouvelables au pluriel mais dans le texte, insiste sur l’énergie solaire.	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) La méthode de collecte des données n’est pas précisée.	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments) Certaines phrases sont à reconstruire	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (Please insert your comments)	3

Il est preferable d'écrire le texte au present de l'indicatif. Revoir la construction des phrases.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il faut réorganiser l'analyse des résultats. Les graphiques et tableaux sont présentés avant leur analyse.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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): L'article peut être corrigé avant sa publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'article peut être publié après la prise en compte des observations.