



**Paper: “La Politique du Bulldozer ou la Gestion Foncière au Cœur des Tensions Sociales à Bamako au Mali”**

**Submitted: 23 April 2020**

**Accepted: 06 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Mahamar Attino

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p266](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p266)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** KRA KOUAKOU VALENTIN

Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Leopold Degbegnon

Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

**Reviewer 3:** Abdoulay Mfewou

University of Dschang-Cameroon

**Reviewer 4:** Blinded

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Léopold DEGBEGNON	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-calavi(Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/06/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>La Politique du Bulldozer ou la gestion foncière au cœur des tensions sociales à Bamako au Mali.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0527/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: <b>yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No: <b>yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No: <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>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The document entitled "The Bulldozer policy or land management at the heart of social tensions in Bamako in Mali." mainly addresses the problem of land management, very few details are given concerning the plitique of the bulldozer, so the best would have been to title the document: "" Land</b>	

<b>management at the heart of social tensions in Bamako in Mali. ""</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The three elements are present in the summary but given the results of the author's work, the objective does not fit too much and must be reformulated.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>the author has made an effort to write, however the document contains errors to be corrected. In addition, the author must above all make the effort to raise the level of language.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The methodology was well applied overall</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>From the overall analysis of the document, we note the following observations:</b> -lack of presentation of the study environment - tables to be corrected (1 and 2) and tables to be completed (3) -review the use of cards and their placement in the document. - the author must generally review the formatting (content and form) of the document.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>the conclusion was well written and consistent with the subject</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>the majority of references are complete and appropriate, but the author must fill in the few missing details.</b>	

**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):** x

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

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Abdoulay Mfewou	Email:
University/Country: University of Dschang-Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/09/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>La Politique du Bulldozer ou la Gestion Foncière urbaine à Bamalo (Mali)</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Sujet intéressant</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ajouter quelques chiffres dans le résumé</b>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>À relire pour éliminer les fautes</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) bien élaboré</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) quelques fautes (à relire)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) à ajouter le rôle de la mairie, du ministère de l'urbanisme...</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>correcte</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):**

**à ajouter**

**Superficie du Mali ? densité de population? dans le résumé**

**Dans le texte**

**à ajouter :**

**rôle des chefferie traditionnelle dans l'occupation foncière?**

**rôle des institutions étatiques dans l'occupation foncière par les acteurs?**

**c'est à dire le ministre en charge de l'urbanisme?**

**rôle de l'élite locale?**

**type de conflit? (conflit entre acteurs: population contre la classe moyenne;**

**population contre la mairie; la population contre l'État...)**

**la médiation par les institutions étatiques pour réguler les conflits?**

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

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: KRA Kouakou Valentin	Email:
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 juin 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 juin 2020
Manuscript Title: La Politique du Bulldozer ou la gestion foncière au cœur des tensions sociales à Bamako au Mali.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0527/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2,5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>trop long résumé</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Des fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1,5</b>
<i>La méthodologie présentée souffre de certaines insuffisances (voir correction dans le texte). Il importe pour l'auteur d'apporter plus de précisions.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>1,5</b>
<i>L'argumentaire présente des insuffisances au niveau de la forme et du fond (voir corrections dans le texte). La discussion reste peu élaborée; voire superficielle et n'est soutenue par aucune théorie sociologique.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>Références bibliographiques mal présentée (confuse)</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):**

Voir instructions à travers le texte.

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



# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: VISSIN Expédit W.	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>POLITIQUE DU BULLDOZER OU LA GESTION FONCIERE AU CŒUR DES TENSIONS SOCIALES A BAMAKO AU MALI</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27052020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre doit être reformulé. Les propositions sont faites directement dans le document	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le résumé ne respecte pas la structuration d'un résumé scientifique. Des propositions ont été faites en mode commentaire dans le document	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les fautes grammaticales sont mineures dans le document. Des corrections ont été faites en mode suivi de modification dans le document	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La démarche méthodologique est mal structurée et n'est pas explicite.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Tout le document est à revoir. Le corps du texte semble être un brouillon.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>L'auteur a fait quelques efforts mais ces parties méritent une restructuration en fonction des observations faites en mode commentaire et suivi de modification</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Il y a des références citées dans le document et qui ne sont pas dans le repertoire des références</b>	

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

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

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

L'auteur a fait un effort de recherche. Mais au regard des observations, des remarques faites sur le document, cela semble être à l'étape de brouillon et qu'il faudra revoir le travail pour le valoriser selon une portée scientifique.

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