

Manuscript: “**Evaluation de la Vulnérabilité à l’Inondation des Communes à Proximité des Grandes Villes Ouest Africaines : Cas de la Commune de Bingerville (Est d’Abidjan – Côte d’Ivoire)**”

**Submitted: 14 January 2021**

**Accepted: 10 March 2021**

**Published: 30 April 2021**

Corresponding Author: Anowa Evrade Larissa Eba

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p277

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Kouao Armand Anoh, Jean Lorougnon Guédé University, Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Degnon Saturnin, 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: Kouao Armand ANOH	Email:
University/Country: Jean Lorougnon Guédé University (Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: 28/01/2021	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Assessment of the Municipalities Near Large West African Cities to Flood Vulnerability: Case of Bingerville Municipality (East of Abidjan)	
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>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>In my humble opinion, the title corresponds to the content of the text</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The abstract is a digest of the study results. However, I would like it give a</b>	

<b>brief overview of the problem.</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>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Authors must be careful of mistakes and errors. They must be consistent in the formulation of references.

# ***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: DEGNON Saturnin	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title : <b>Evaluation de la Vulnérabilité à l'Inondation des Communes à Proximité des Grandes Villes Ouest Africaines : Cas de la Commune de Bingerville (l'Est d'Abidjan)</b> <b>Assessment of the Flood Vulnerability of Municipalities Near Large West African Cities: Case of the Municipality of Bingerville (East of Abidjan)</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>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Le résumé présente les objectifs et les approches méthodologiques mais les résultats ne sont pas bien présentés dans le résumé</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Peu d'erreurs</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>L'approche méthodologique est explicite</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La formulation de quelques phrases à revoir</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La conclusion peut être améliorée</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les références sont complètes et appropriées, mais il faut uniformiser la présentation des auteurs</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication