



**Paper: “Déterminants socio-économiques et culturels de l'adoption de la digitalisation agricole par les agriculteurs vulnérables au Togo : le cas de la subvention électronique des engrais”**

**Submitted: 02 December 2025**

**Accepted: 12 June 2026**

**Published: 30 June 2026**

Corresponding Author: Madadozi Tezike

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p190

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: SANA Ibrahim

Center for Economic and Social Documentation and Research (CEDRES) Thomas Sankara University, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Kouelo Alladassi Félix

Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Émile Blaise Siéwé Pougoué

Université de Dschang (UDs), Faculté d'Agronomie et des Sciences Agricoles (FASA), Cameroun

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Center for Economic and Social Documentation and Research (CEDRES) Thomas Sankara University, Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 1 er april	Date Review Report Submitted: 8 april
Manuscript Title: Socio-economic and cultural determinants of the adoption of agricultural digitalization by vulnerable farmers in Togo: the case of the electronic fertilizer subsidy	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 03.---37.12.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes, no problem	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Ok	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The title does not accurately reflect the content of the manuscript.</i></p> <p><i>You mention beneficiaries' adoption of "agricultural digitization" and "digital subsidies," yet throughout your document, your literature review focuses solely on the effects of fertilizer subsidies.</i></p> <p><i>Revise the title so that it matches the content</i></p>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>Yes, but there are a lot of inconsistencies in the summary that need to be corrected)</i></p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><i>There are too many grammars, conjugation, spelling, and syntax errors to correct.</i></p> <p><i>Use a scientific writing style.</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The justification for the analytical method is very weak.</i></li> <li>• <i>You should discuss the analytical methods you have read about in the literature for similar research before justifying the relevance of the method you have chosen.</i></li> <li>• <i>We do not know the variables you wish to model or their descriptions</i></li> <li>• <i>You must also explain why you chose these variables and not others</i></li> <li>• <i>Create a table presenting your variables and describe them</i></li> </ul>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The results are not presented clearly.</i></li> <li>• <i>Please rephrase the interpretation of the results.</i></li> <li>• <i>We cannot see the key factors you are referring to.</i></li> <li>• <i>All key factors should be addressed point by point. Please insert your comments)</i></li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>The conclusion should summarize the objectives and scope of your research.</i></p> <p><i>And what about your hypothesis? Has it been confirmed or refuted?</i></p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>The references are well presented, but when there are multiple authors in the article, they should be listed in chronological order (from oldest to most recent).</i></p>	

**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): All comments are in the tracked changes document**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: RAS**