

Paper: “Conflits Communautaires Liés À L’exploitation Du Patrimoine Forestier De L’état : L’exemple De La Forêt Classée De Goin-Débé Dans Le Département De Guiglo”

Submitted: 30 July 2020

Accepted: 23 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Adje N’goran Pascal

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n32p102

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Alexis Ndabarushimana
National School of Administration, Burundi

Reviewer 2: Diarassouba Ibrahima
Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Mamam S. Toleba
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

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: Prof. Alexis Ndabarushimana Whatsapp: +25779432195	
University/Country: National School of Administration / Burundi	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/11/2020
Manuscript Title: CONFLITS COMMUNAUTAIRES LIES A L'EXPLOITATION DU PATRIMOINE FORESTIER DE L'ETAT: L'EXEMPLE DE LA FORET CLASSEE DE GOIN-DEBE DANS LE DEPARTEMENT DE GUIGLO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0849/20	
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> Ok	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ok	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ok	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La problématique manque toujours de paradoxe	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ok	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ok	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Ok	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prière d'ajouter le paradoxe dans la problématique comme indiqué

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: Diarassouba Ibrahima	Email:
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Conflits communautaires lies a l'exploitation du patrimoine forestier de l'Etat: l'exemple de la forêt classée de Goin-debe dans le département de Guiglo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49.08.2020	
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>Bonne adéquation entre le titre et le contenu du document. Bonne qualité dans la rédaction</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>L'ensemble des éléments du résumé sont pris en compte</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Travail bien rédigé dans le fond et la forme	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion est bien élaborée, mais elle n'ouvre pas de perspective</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Quelques incohérences sont à signaler dans la bibliographie. Certaines référence du texte n'existent pas dans la bibliographie. D'autres ont des dates qui ne correspondent pas</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'auteur doit faire l'effort d'harmoniser sa bibliographie. Elle présente certaines incohérences qui doivent être nécessairement corrigées avant la publication de cet article. Trouvez ci-dessous ces références :

A. Elles sont citées dans le corps du document mais ne figurent pas dans les références bibliographiques

1. (FAO, 2001).
2. loi N°65-425 du 10 décembre 1965
3. loi N°2014-427 du 14 juillet 2014
4. Amani Yao Celestin (2011) **Amani C (2017)** y figure, mais pas Amani Yao Célestein **(2011)**
5. Arrêté de classement n° 197/MINEFOR/DDAR du 24-06-1978
6. Ministère Eaux et Forêts, 2016
7. Le journal Connection ivoirienne du 6 octobre 2017
8. Chauveau (2006) Page 12

B. Cet auteur (Durkheim) n'existe pas dans le texte

1. Durkheim 1912 : (Il est cité dans les références bibliographiques, mais n'a pas été cité dans le corps du document)

C. Pour ces deux auteurs, la date dans le texte et celle de la bibliographie ne concordent pas

1. Dunlap et Catton (dans votre référence bibliographique c'est 2017, alors que dans le texte en début de la page 3 c'est 1979)
2. LeBillon, (dans le texte c'est 2009 alors que dans votre référence bibliographique c'est mis 2003)

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: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 06.10.20	Date Review Report Submitted: 13.10.20
Manuscript Title: CONFLITS COMMUNAUTAIRES LIÉS À L'EXPLOITATION DU PATRIMOINE FORESTIER DE L'ÉTAT: L'EXEMPLE DE LA FORÊT CLASSÉE DE GOIN-DEBE DANS LE DÉPARTEMENT DE GUIGLO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0849/20	
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	4,5

article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a encore des coquilles qui persistent, il faut en tenir compte ! Et surtout n'attendez pas que l'Examineur procède à toutes les corrections à votre place !!! Faire attention aux noms propres de personnes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Faire attention dans la rédaction.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3,0
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a des termes qui ne s'accrochent pas avec une rédaction d'article scientifique. Bien relire et reformuler certains concepts. Des retraits à la ligne qui ne sont pas respectés par endroits. Attention aux phrases inachevées. Bien centrer souvent les tableaux...	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,0
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusion acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Dans le texte, seul le nom est cité, les prénoms sont réservés pour la bibliographie !!! Revoir également les conditions d'utilisation de et al. Tenir compte des recommandations de l'Examineur !	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Texte à relire posément. Bon courage !!!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

////