

Manuscript: “**Analyse de la Rentabilité Économique du Maraîchage d’hivernage dans les Communes d’Imanan et de Tagazar au Niger**”

**Submitted: 19 March 2021**

**Accepted: 01 May 2021**

**Published: 31 May 2021**

Corresponding Author: Idrissa Guisso Maïga Djibril

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p362

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Degla Pamphile, Benin

**Reviewer 2:** Brahim Esdras Soro, Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 3:** Blinded

**Reviewer 4:** Sadibou Sow, Institut Supérieur de Formation Agricole et Rurale,  
Université Alioune Diop, Senegal

**Reviewer 5:** Kouame Konan, Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte  
d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 6:** Illou Mahamadou, Université de Zinder, Département de géographie

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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: DEGLA Pamphile	
University/Country: Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.03.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.03.2021
Manuscript Title: Analyse de la rentabilité économique du maraichage d'hivernage dans les communes d'Imanan et de Tagazar au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes / <del>No</del>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes / <del>No</del>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes / <del>No</del>	

## **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>2</b>
<i>The title is clear, but the development made by the author does not more reflect exactly the content of the title. For instance, two municipalities were mentioned as the study area. Nowhere in the article the results were presented according to these two municipalities. If the two municipalities are not different one from the other, why does the author choose them?</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>Apart from some inconsistencies in the article, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are many mistakes in the article. Some of them have been highlighted in yellow to better attract the author's attention. In addition, many sentences are poorly worded throughout the document.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>All parts of the study methods are not clearly explained. For instance, it is not clear, how the farmers haven been selected. Also, it is not clear, why among all the methods of profitability estimation and determinants identification that exist in the literature and that the author failed to present, he simply chooses the Cobb-Douglas function. He also failed to explain why only the variables he put in his model are relevant and not others. He needs a theoretical support.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The results are presented in very poor language. There are too many assertions without any theoretical support. The analysis of the results is very weak and their comparison with evidence from the literature is lacking. None of the tables presented are referenced in the text.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The summary is not as accurate. It reflects the weakness of the analysis of the results of the article</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Most of the references are from gray literature. Only one reference out of the 19 (5%) is a published article</i>	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Use clearer and more precise language

Improve the presentation and the analysis of the results

Use more appropriate literature.

Improve discussion of results

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 mars 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Analyse de la rentabilité économique du maraichage d’hivernage dans les communes d’Imanan et de Tagazar au Niger.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06042021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **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>4</b>
<i>Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu mais il existe des phrases trop longues à reformuler en des phrases courtes et concises.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Le résumé est assez clair et succinct</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Il existe trop de fautes grammaticales dans tout le corps de ce document. Des phrases à reformuler</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Le plan de la méthodologie a été mal élaborée dans l'ensemble.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les résultats n'ont pas été suffisamment bien présentés. Avec une discussion mal élaborée.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>La conclusion est assez bien élaborée</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Certaines références bibliographiques n'ont pas été citées. Voir le guide des auteurs de ESJ pour le format.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. Commentaires généraux

L'étude traite d'un sujet important pour les pays tropicaux et chauds en développement (le défi de l'amélioration de la productivité pour nourrir une population en croissance rapide). L'originalité de votre travail porte principalement sur le modèle utilisé pour évaluer la rentabilité économique des cultures maraîchères, véritable alternative pour la diversification des revenus en hivernage.

Néanmoins, votre travail serait plus intéressant si vous aviez également comparé vos résultats avec les travaux réalisés sur ces cultures maraîchères dans la même région (notamment au Mali et au Sénégal) ou dans le monde.

2. Introduction

Le contexte et la problématique assez bien exposés. Cependant il existe trop de fautes grammaticales et syntaxiques.

3. Méthodes

Revoir le plan de la partie Matériel et Méthodes. Les méthodes décrites doivent être présentées de façon liminaire et ne doivent pas faire l'objet d'une description trop détaillée. Vous pouvez juste dire que vous avez utilisé le modèle de certains auteurs que vous citez avec une explication brève de ce modèle.

Dans cette partie, le logiciel utilisé pour le traitement statistique des données n'a pas été présenté. Le type d'analyse avec les différentes interprétations ne sont pas perçus.

#### 4. Résultats-Discussion

Il existe plusieurs fautes grammaticales et syntaxiques dans le texte. Pour cette partie, il faut avoir réalisé une bonne bibliographie. Ce travail n'est pas certainement le premier dans cette région de l'Afrique ou alors il a été réalisé aussi dans d'autres pays en dehors de l'Afrique. La discussion doit être bien élaborée

#### 5. Références

Revoir tous les auteurs cités dans le texte et dans les Références : tous ne sont pas références. Voir le guide aux auteurs pour le format.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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 Sadibou SOW	Email:
University/Country: Université Alioune Diop/Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/3/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/04/2021
Manuscript Title: Analyse de la rentabilité économique du maraichage d'hivernage dans les communes d'Imanan et de Tagazar au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.04.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <del>Yes</del> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <del>No</del>	

## **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>5</b>
the title is clear and is adequate to the content of the article	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
the summary is well written and highlights the main results, the objectives sought and the method is well presented	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>il faut noter des fautes d'orthographe et d'inattention  L'écriture des noms des auteurs est à corriger elle doit être en miniscule.  Dans l'introduction la 14ème ou 15 eme phrase est longue et incomprehensible.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>Dans materiel et methode: expliquer la base de choix de l'échantillon pourquoi 22,7% ?</p> <p>Methode et determination des determinants de la rentabilité:  Revoir certains concepts comme la difference entre rentabilité et bénéfice, le capital qui est différent du stock?</p> <p>Expliquer le type d'amortissement utiliser, La formule seulement ne suffit pas  Model empirique, point 2.3.5 expliquer les éléments de l'équation Cobb- Douglass, sur quelle période est fait l'analyse c'est à dire combien d'année, une seule année ne peut donner des résultats fiables?</p> <p>Ecrire les auteurs en minuscule</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<p>3.3 Analyse de la rentabilité économique et financière : il y a erreur sur le cout des variables c'est 8,23% à la place de 82,35%. En comparaison avec la production du maïs ici la comparaison n'est pas adaptée si la production du maïs est produite en saison sèche.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>la conclusion RAS</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>RAS</p>	



--

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

L'article est bien rédigé et cadre avec le contexte. Cependant il y a des nuances avec certains concepts qu'il faut vérifier. L'analyse économétrique n'a pas expliqué la période revue car une année ne suffit pas pour tirer des conclusions. Il faut nous édifier sur le choix de la période. Il faut aussi expliquer la base de choix de l'échantillon comment vous aviez fait?

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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: KOUAME Konan	Email:
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Etude de l'arrière effet des légumineuses alimentaires sur la productivité des légumes : cas de la tomate</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0437/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.**

<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>
<i>(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>3</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(The abstract is acceptable)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(There are many grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(The study methods are not clearly explained)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The results are acceptable but not very presented.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The conclusion are accurate and supported)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The references are comprehensive and are not clearly written)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Author** must take into account these observations to improve the document

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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: ILLOU Mahamadou	Email:
University/Country: Zinder/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.04.2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Analyse de la rentabilité économique du maraichage d’hivernage dans les communes d’Imanan et de Tagazar au Niger.</b> <b>Analyze of economicprofitability ofrainymarketgarden in the municipalities of Imanan and Tagazar in Niger.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.04.2021 (1)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.**

<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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) les résultats sont assez claires. Seulement, l'auteur a mélangé résultats et discussions. Il aurait fallu présenter séparément les résultats et la discussion</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

Le sujet est très intéressant. Vous devrez reprendre l'analyse des résultats pour minimiser l'approche par moyenne. Il faut une séparation nette des résultats et de la discussion. Vous devez revoir l'organisation du document. La carte de présentation de la zone d'étude doit être reprise pour être plus lisible. Les autres commentaires sont dans le document.

