

Paper: “Impact des Paramètres Climatiques sur la Production Rizicole dans les Différentes Régions de Côte d’Ivoire: Cas du Haut Sassandra, Goh, Poro, Tonkpi, Gbêkê, et N’zi”

Submitted: 14 July 2022

Accepted: 01 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Assi Yapo Fulgence

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n34p147

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Achy Landry

Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Joachim Bonkougou

INERA, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 4: Jean Arnaud N'drin

Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 01/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/11/2022
Manuscript Title: Impact of climate change on rice production in the different regions of Côte d'Ivoire: cases of Haut Sassandra, Goh, Poro, Tonkpi, Gbêkê, and N'zi	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0754	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No - NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No - NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No - 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.	2
<i>The title needs to be shorter and attract the reader's attention.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>The Abstract section mentions, “The objective of this article is to analyze the effect that the climate change may have on rice production in the different regions of Côte d'Ivoire from 2016 to 2019”. So why does the author not use data from 2020 and 2021?</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The English language (Abstract section) should be seriously improved. We suggest that to author pay attention to the French language. For example, the title of section five – “Conclusion et implications de politiques economiques” –is correct “economiques”</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The research methodology protocols needed to be clearly described.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results must be interpretive rather than just descriptive and connect the research results with relevant literature citations for validity and reliability. The discussions of the results should connect the research results with relevant literature citations.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The research data does not support the conclusion, which does not indicate a clearer path for future studies on the topic. The Conclusions section can be improved by including the key focus of the study.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>The references are limited to 17 sources and are very old. The newest source is from 2018, and then is one source from 2016, and three sources from 2014. We suggest adding new sources related to the subject of the paper. Of course, the references must respect the journal style, and the sources must be correctly mentioned.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper should be improved:

In the Introduction section, we suggest adding additional literature to support the paper's objective and explain why it is important for this research study.

In the Introduction section, it is optional to mention the following subtitles 1.1. Contexte de l'étude; 1.2. Revue de littérature sur la relation entre le changement climatique et la production du riz. However, it is essential to keep their content and make the research ideas more effective through elaborative and concise sentences.

The subsection 1.2 Revue de littérature sur la relation entre le changement climatique et la production du riz, should be the section 2. Revue de littérature sur la relation entre le changement climatique et la production du riz.

The author should explain in further detail the research gaps in the industry that the paper seeks to close and why the paper is needed to recognize the current gaps in the literature knowledge.

The citation of the sources in the body of the article should be (Greene, 2008) and not (William H. Greene, 2008).

Good luck!

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
The paper should be seriously improved.**

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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!

Date Manuscript Received : 21/02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted : 14/03/2023
Manuscript Title : Impact du changement climatique sur la production du riz dans les différentes régions de Côte d'Ivoire : cas du Haut Sassandra, de Gôh, de Poro, de Tonkpi, de Gbêkê et de N'zi	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper : Yes/No	

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.	3
RAS	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Voir l'article de l'auteur.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Il y a des fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire à corriger. L'auteur doit améliorer son niveau de langue.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>RAS</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats sont acceptables.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Voir l'article pour les commentaires sur cette partie.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Voir l'article pour les commentaires sur cette partie</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Efforts should be made to improve the final version of the article for publication

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: N'drin Owo Jean Arnaud	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny - Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Impact du changement climatique sur la production du riz dans les différentes régions de Côte d'Ivoire : cas du Haut Sassandra, de Gôh, de Poro, de Tonkpi, de Gbêkê et de N'zi	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36-54.07.2022	
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.

<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.	2

Le titre de l'article est un peu confus et lourd. Ainsi, il ne se trouve pas en étroite relation avec le contenu de l'article. L'on ne retrouve pas des analyses détaillées de chaque région citée. L'énoncé du sujet dans l'introduction ne correspond pas au titre de l'article, l'auteur ferait mieux d'harmoniser les choses à ce niveau et pour tout le contenu	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Les deux premières phrases du résumé prêtent la confusion sur l'objectif de l'étude. La méthodologie n'est pas expliquée et les résultats ne sont pas suffisamment énoncés dans le résumé.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Il y a moins de fautes de grammaire, mais pour un travail plus parfait, l'auteur doit relire attentivement pour débarrasser le document des toutes les fautes existantes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
La méthodologie est bien détaillée, difficile à comprendre à cause des termes trop techniques	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Les résultats ne correspondent pas au titre et ne sont pas détaillés par zone citée.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Difficile d'établir une relation étroite entre le résumé, la conclusion et le contenu de l'article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
La bibliographie est bien fournie et les ouvrages sont adaptés. Cependant, l'on retrouve des auteurs cités dans l'article qui ne figurent pas dans la bibliographie.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'auteur gagnerait à se concentrer sur une zone bien définie ou à mieux adapter le contenu de l'article au titre. Il gagnerait également à expliquer clairement en des thèmes plus simples et rendre compréhensif son contenu. Les tableaux des résultats ne sont pas bien analysés et interprétés

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Merci pour la confiance renouvelée!

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Bonkougou Joachim	
University/Country: INERA Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/02/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of climate change on rice production in the different regions of Côte d'Ivoire: cases of Haut Sassandra, Goh, Poro, Tonkpi, Gbêkê, and N'zi.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36—54.07.2022	
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.

<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.	1

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

La structuration standard d'un article est à respecter. Le climat n'est pas à confondre avec le changement climatique. L'article traite de l'impact des paramètres climatiques. ET c'est curieux que la superficie en ressorte pour expliquer la production. Elle n'est pas un paramètre climatique. Il faut reprendre l'analyse pour mettre l'accent sur les rendements de riz.