

Manuscript: “**Les contraintes socio-environnementales du manque d’eau potable au sein des villages Avikam du cordon littoral de Grand-Lahou (Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 06 February 2021

Accepted: 09 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Dadi Reine Prisca

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p70

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ibo Guehi Jonas, Université Nangui-Abrogoua, Abidjan Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Tra Fulbert, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Dr. Ir. 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: IBO GUEHI Jonas	
University/Country: Université Nangui-Abrogoua, Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 /02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 /02/2021
Manuscript Title: Les contraintes socio-environnementales du manque d'eau potable au sein des villages Avikam du cordon littoral de Grand-Lahou (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0271/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair et exprime bien l'objet de l'article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est bien rédigé et agencé de manière cohérente. Il permet de	

percevoir l'intention de recherché de l'auteur	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le texte contient très peu de fautes grammaticales. Les longues tournures ont été corrigées par mes soins.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie a été bien exposée. Il s'agit d'une méthodologie rigoureuse qui garantit la validité des résultats de la recherché.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats ont été bien présentés dans une suite logique et cohérente. Le développement fait dans cet article met en relief les résultats probants de la recherché sur les contraintes socio-environnementales de l'accès à l'eau potable des populations du cordon littoral de Grand-Lahou. Les différents propos d'acteurs permettent de dire que le sujet a été bien traité. Aucune fausse information n'a été constatée.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion est claire. Elle résume les principaux résultats de la recherche. Les recommandations faites à l'issue de ce travail y ont été rappelées.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références bibliographiques sont bien à propos.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'auteur doit procéder aux corrections suggérées dans ce rapport d'évaluation en mode révision directement dans le corps du texte.
Les données générales sur l'accès à l'eau en Côte d'Ivoire devront être actualisées.
Il faudrait faire référence aux objectifs du Développement Durable au lieu des OMD.

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: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.03.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.03.21
Manuscript Title: Les contraintes socio-environnementales du manque d'eau potable au sein des villages Avikam du cordon littoral de Grand-Lahou (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0271/21	
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.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Titre acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<i>Résumé acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Félicitations pour les efforts, bon courage.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Méthodologie acceptable.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Félicitations et bon courage !</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Conclusion acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bon courage, bonne chance !</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):

Bon courage et bonne chance à l'Auteur.