
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.

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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: PRESSION AGROFONCIERE ET MUTATIONS AGRAIRES SUR LE PLATEAU ADJA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 133	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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. (a brief explanation is recommendable) Le titre est cohérent avec le contenu de l'article	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. (a brief explanation is recommendable) Les objectifs et les méthodes sont bien présentés ; cependant la présentation du résumé est à améliorer.	3
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (a brief explanation is recommendable) Il y a encore quelques petites coquilles à corriger	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

Les méthodes sont bien présentées ; cependant les sources des auteurs doivent être citées

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

3

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

Il y a des corrections à faire surtout sur les noms auteurs à citer dans la bibliographie ; supprimer les auteurs qui ne sont dans le texte et compléter la discussion

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

3

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

L'auteur doit compléter quelques stastitiques

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

3

(a brief explanation is recommendable)

Il est impérieux d'enlever tous les auteurs qui ne sont pas cités dans l'article et de compléter ceux qui manque.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: