

Manuscript: “**Cartographie de L’accessibilité et Gouvernance Locale des Infrastructures Hydrauliques dans la Commune D’avrankou Au Sud-Est du Benin**”

Submitted: 31 August 2021

Accepted: 20 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Sandé Zannou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p269

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fabrice Mopi

Reviewer 2: Kadjegbin Toundé Roméo Gislain University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

Reviewer 3: Armand Josué DJAH, Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 03/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Cartographie des accessibilités et gouvernance des infrastructures hydrauliques dans la Commune d'avrankou au sud-est du Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0944/21	
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.	4
<i>Le titre est mal formulé. Le terme accessibilité ne se met pas au pluriel et en plus il faudrait parler de gouvernance locale plutôt que de gouvernance tout simplement lorsqu'il s'agit d'une gestion par les communautés et collectivités locales .</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé ne fait pas ressortir clairement le problème traité et l'objectif du travail. La méthodologie n'est pas bien illustrée</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Il existe de nombreuses fautes grammaticales à toiletter, des problèmes de syntaxe et de sémantique qu'il faut revoir</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Certains aspects de la méthodologie restent à élucider. De plus, il se trouve que des outils de collecte de données (questionnaires/fiches d'enquêtes) et traitement et d'analyse (fréquences, graphiques et tableaux élaborés dans Excel 2013) tels qu'évoqués dans la méthodologie ne ressortent pas dans les résultats. Ceci traduit une certaine incohérence</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats sont mal structurés dans l'ensemble et comportent des éléments qui n'ont pratiquement aucun rapport avec le sujet traité. Les cartes sont touffues avec des cercles qui se superposent, ce qui rend la compréhension difficile</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est globalement bien structure en dépit que quelques fautes et des problèmes sémantiques relevés</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>La bibliographie est relativement bien structurée, bien que pauvre</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Sujet intéressant, mais mal structuré dans l'ensemble. Les résultats des enquêtes réalisées auprès des ménages comme mentionnés dans la méthodologie n'apparaissent nulle part dans le travail; ce qui traduit des incohérences. Vous gagnerez mieux de partir d'une typologie descriptive des infrastructures hydrauliques, et présenter ensuite leur état et répartition spatiale, puis les modes de gestion et problèmes qu'ils posent, pour enfin proposer des solutions pour une gestion optimale de ces infrastructures.

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!

Email: KADJEBIN Toundé Roméo Gislain	
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/09/2021
Manuscript Title: CARTOGRAPHIE DES ACCESSIBILITES ET GOUVERNANCE DES INFRASTRUCTURES HYDRAULIQUES DANS LA COMMUNE D'AVRANKOU AU SUD-EST DU BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44.09.2021	
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.	5
<i>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The abstract is clear. But some few mistakes has committed and need to be corrected</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some grammatical mistakes in this article and its needed to be corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, the methods used are cleared</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes the results are clear but it contains some errors which are related in the manuscript and needed to be corrected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion and the summary are accurate despite some few errors detected which must be corrected</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are not conformed, contained few scientific articles references and it needed to be corrected as indicate by the corrector</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The method used to determine the sample must be reviewed and completed seriously.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The bibliographies' references of this article must to be completed seriously with the recent authors and Scientific's articles.

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: Armand Josué DJAH	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 1september 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 September 2021
Manuscript Title: MAPPING OF ACCESSIBILITY AND GOVERNANCE OF INFRASTRUCTURES HYDRAULICS IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF AVRANKOU, SOUTH-EAST OF BENIN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0944/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<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.	4
<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.	4
<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	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Veuillez renforcer votre Bibliographie. Cela peut impacter votre Discussion par la prise en de nouveaux auteurs lu.