

Paper: “La Condition de la Femme au Foyer et de l'Enfant Orphelin dans la Communication Sociale à Travers l’Ahossi chez les Agni-Morofouè de Côte d’Ivoire: Plaidoyer pour un Mieuxêtre”

Submitted: 19 October 2022

Accepted: 26 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Kouakou Oi Kouakou Benoît

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n35p80

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: A. Florence Agney
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Gnamien Konan Bah
Universite Jean Lorougnon Guede, Daloa Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr AGNEY	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Korhogo/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: Samedi 29 octobre 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: Lundi 31 octobre
Manuscript Title: La condition de la femme et de l'enfant orphelin dans la communication sociale à travers l'<i>ahossi</i> chez les Agni-Morofouè de Côte d'Ivoire : plaidoyer pour un mieux-être	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1116/22	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre de l'article bien qu'il soit long est en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est bien mené. Il rend clairement compte de la recherche. Il présente la méthode de recherche ainsi que la théorie utilisé dans le travail.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthode de recherche a été expliquée clairement et cela a conduit à des résultats très intéressants.	
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.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'article est publiable en l'état. L'auteur a produit un travail original. La théorie est adaptée à son travail. Le texte est agréable à lire.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name:	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>(Le titre reflète le contenu de l'article)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>(Le résumé présente le problème, les objectifs, la méthodologie. Il donne également une idée des résultats)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(L'article est grammaticalement bien contruit avec très peu de fautes. Ce sont deux de frappes en tout et pour tout)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Les outils méthodologiques sont clairement indiqués et, surtout, sont visibles dans les résultats.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Les résultats sont édifiants et pertinents avec un ensemble des supports de chansons utilisés comme fragments ethnographiques pour donner de la vie au texte.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(La conclusion résume bien les résultats)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Les références sont adéquates et certaines sont très actuelles, surtout au niveau de la discussion)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'article est franchement bien construit et agréable à lire. Des efforts sont fait pour rendre la compréhension des problèmes évoqués accessible. Des légères corrections de forme sont à voir pour rendre cet article excellent.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'auteur a fait un travail de recherche qui est une forme d'Ethnomusicologie. L'article soulève un problème pertinent et se fait le relais de ce plaidoyer des chanteurs de l'*Ahossi qui militent pour la dignité de la femme et prônent un meilleur traitement de l'orphelin. L'originalité de cet article s'associe avec la qualité de la rédaction qui est pratiquement sans fautes majeures. L'article est facile à lire. Une fois commencé, vous*

avez envie de le terminer. Nous recommandons sa publication avec la correction des deux fautes indiquées.

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!

University/Country: University Alassane Ouattara / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/11/2022
Manuscript Title: The condition of housewife and orphaned child in social communication through the <i>ahossi</i> among the Agni-Morofouè of Côte d'Ivoire: a plea for wellness	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1116/22	
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: No	
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.	3
The title of the article "The condition of housewife and orphaned child in social communication through the <i>ahossi</i> among the Agni-Morofouè of Côte d'Ivoire: a plea	

for wellness", lacks precision. The concept condition must be theoretically encoded. Here, it is about the socio-cultural condition of the woman in the home and the orphan child.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is clear and relates to the object of study "the socio-cultural conditions of the woman in a couple and the orphan child in the musicological repertoire of the Agni of Côte d'Ivoire". Also, it presents the methodological approach (theory of analysis), the descriptive model of communication in Lasswell. A small difference is observed, the methodology cannot be the repertoires of songs mobilized as the author wants to make believe.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The text is generally well written, but has some small irregularities. The syntactic structure of the first sentence of the introduction is biased by improper punctuation (hyphens that litter the sentence). Also, quotations in quotation marks must be in italics as well as the words of the text in local language must be all in quotation marks and in italics (these are not words in French).	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The author presents an inconsistent methodological approach. It solicits the socio-anthropological approach but its study is fundamentally based on the discographic data of youtube. Anthropology or Sociology are experimental disciplines (field survey), it proceeds the logical-deductive method. This study is purely mediagraphic (sound sources from youtube).	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results contain irregularities. First, the body of the text is not structured in a numerological way, as is appropriate for this type of exercise (exemple, I.Results. I.1. Introduction to the sound texts of the mediagraphy "Youtube" etc). In addition, the table presents an incomplete source. the date of preparation of the data in the table is missing (example, Source: our investigations, April 2022). Quotations of authors in quotation marks must be in italics and as well as the words in local language " <i>Agni</i> " between quotation marks and in italics, they are not French terms.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion makes the thematic assessment of the study but, it, seems occulted that of the theoretical and methodological framework. It could also envisage an opening on the problem of customary law (traditional) and contemporary law (state) in the management of social inequalities in African societies.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The bibliography respects the order of the documents consulted in this work. However, the discographic references are not appropriate, here, the author makes a webography of the sound sources of Youtube.	

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):

Methodological and editorial corrections must necessarily be integrated into the text by following the comments mentioned in the correction grid.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is acceptable, however the author must necessarily correct the pitfalls noted.