

Paper: “Les mécanismes d’exécution des projets de développement durable en Côte d’ivoire”

Submitted: 26 August 2019

Accepted: 22 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Patrick Patrick Adon

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p220](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p220)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Affessi Adon Simon
UPGC, Korhogo, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Wari A. Moussa
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2019

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: AFFESSI Adon Simon	Email:
University/Country: UPGC Korhogo	
Date Manuscript Received: 29-08-2019	Date Review Report Submitted: 15-09-2019
Manuscript Title: Les mécanismes d'exécution des projets de développement durable en Côte d'ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/19	
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 published version 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

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Préciser le champ de l'étude ;tel qu'il se présente donne un sujet très large à traiter	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Préciser dans le résumé la méthodologie de collecte de données ; l'échantillon etc	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Pas assez de fautes grammaticales</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Oui mais des précisions restent à donner, confère le texte	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3,5
Des corrections sont à apporter pour une meilleure qualité du travail	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion est à revoir; ne pas citer d'auteurs dans la conclusion. Ici il est question de faire le bilan de ton travail	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
Je souhaite que l'auteur fasse une référence bibliographique selon la norme APA	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revisions 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 tenir compte des corrections et suggestions afin de parfaire son travail

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2019

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: WARI A. Moussa	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 août 2019	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Les mécanismes d'exécution des projets de développement durable en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/19	
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 published version 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.	03
<i>(Le titre est relativement Claire, mais, l'objet scientifique ou la problématique n'accroche pas trop</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	02
<i>(les méthodes utilisées ne sont pas décrites dans le résumé)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	02,5
<i>(Quelques erreurs grammaticales survivent dans le texte, notamment les accords, la syntaxe, le temps....)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5
<i>(Il y a quelques points sur les éléments de la méthodologie, la technique du choix de l'échantillon (150) n'est pas expliquée)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Le texte de l'article est relativement bien rédigé, cependant, il y a quelques fois des maladroites, par exemple les commentaires qui suivent les figures ne sont mis en connexion avec ces dernières. La figure 1 est intervenue brusquement sans être annoncée. L'auteur devrait citer au moins 5 auteurs d'autorité pour construire son introduction, ce qui n'est pas le cas.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(L'auteur devra éviter de citer un auteur en référence dans une conclusion)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Quelques erreurs à corriger sur la manière d'écrire les prénoms des auteurs et co)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dans l'ensemble l'auteur a écrit un arcle intéressant, mais, il devrait s'efforcer à l'etoffer dans l'introduction, la méthodologie, le style dans le commentaire des figures et le placement ainsi que la formulation de leurs titres.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Merci de nous faire confiance en nous envoyant des articles à lire et corriger, nous serons toujours à votre disposition.