

---

# 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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Cartographie de l'évolution démographique et atteinte de l'objectif du développement durable dans le secteur de l'eau dans le Hollidjé au sud-est du Bénin</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>N°49</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The title is clear enough and the content of the manuscript is in tie with this title. A deepening of some aspects is sufficient merely.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The summary presents all aspects but the style is not very clear to dawns it where the information put in inscription lose their scientific value</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The article includes numerous spelling errors and the omissions of words that sometimes make the understanding difficult. The candidate would win to improve his style of writing and debit to read and to reread his manuscript before the resubmission</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>The methodological approach is a little vague. The population of survey is not put in inscription, as well as his size. The selection criteria of the population are not specified. The methodology is not clearly definite. Finally, the utilized information didn't appear. The methodology must be more rigorous.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>The body of the text deserves new integrations and corrections in order to its scientific improvement</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>Yes, but these findings miss required</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
<b>The bibliographic references are not adequate for some authors. Sometimes, the reference is different from the author that the tenderer aims. A harmonization is necessary for a correction of the authors and a presentation according to the norms of advisable bibliographic presentation.</b>	

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

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

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

**The introduction is not very convincing. The need of research or the faille is not justified; the objective, the question of research and the hypothesis are not clearly formulated. For recall, the introduction must present the known general context, the known more specific stakes, the unknown problem no again treaty in the literature, the hypothesis or the objectives of the reflection.**

**The methodology questions the results again, because it doesn't specify the led actions rigorously. It deserves to be reviewed of way more rigourseuse.**

**The exposed results are not debated à relatively the previous works and according to the progression of the results. It is necessary to debate inevitably each result. It exists per moment of the elements but clumsily expositions.**

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

**RAS**

