

Manuscript: “**De la Degradation de l’habitat Social Comme Consequence de sa Politique d’entretien par les Syndics a Abidjan : Cas des Coproprietes Sogefiha d’Abobo et Sicogi d’Adjame**”

Submitted: 10 June 2021

Accepted: 01 July 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Adoua Affoua Krah Elisabeth

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n23p177

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Mialoundama Bakouetila Gilles Freddy
Ecole Nationale Supérieure d’Agronomie et de Foresterie (ENSAF), Université
Marien Nguabi

Reviewer 3: Habamungu Bashwira John
Universite Officielle De Bukavu, Rdc

Reviewer 4: N’guessan Tenguel Sosthene
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 16/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/06/2021
Manuscript Title: Modes of management and degradation of social housing in Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire): case of the SICOGI of Adjame and SOGEFIHA of Abobo condominiums	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0661/21	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and precise. it highlights its object of study which is the management of social housing and specifies that it is about co-ownership. Thus, subject is not confusing.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract presents the object, the method and the results.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The document is fairly well written with almost no grammatical and spelling errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The author adopts a rigorous and clear methodological approach. The techniques and methods presented since the introduction are followed throughout the work. However, the section devoted to effect is too compartmentalized and gives the impression of being in a typical exercise of dissertations and theses. The study methods (qualitative or quantitative study) were not specified.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results are well presented with illustrations (verbatim, graphics and images). On the other hand, the images are silent, for lack of comments to describe them to the state.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The author makes a simple assessment of the results but that of the methodological process used is omitted. Also, there is no mention of a research perspective (line of thought or forthcoming work on the subject dealt with).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Bibliographic references are appropriate to the text. however, the second mention has an incomplete webographic mention (incomplete web link).	

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):

The author must include his study in a methodological approach (qualitative and / or quantitative) in order to avoid any confusion in the use and interpretation of data in the study. The author must be succinct in the presentation of the study method, emphasizing the methods and techniques of study. Then, the time allotted to the survey. Finally, the theory of analysis of study results.

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: HABAMUNGU BASHWIRA JOHN	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE OFFICIELLE DE BUKAVU/RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/06/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/06/2021
Manuscript Title: MODES DE GESTION ET DEGRADATION DE L'HABITAT SOCIAL A ABIDJAN (COTE D'IVOIRE) : CAS DES COPROPRIETES SOGEFIHA D'ABOBO ET SICOGI D'ADJAME	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.06.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES/OUI	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES/OUI	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES/OUI	

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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LE TITRE N'EST PAS CLAIR, IL PRETE A CONFUSION. VOUS TROUVEREZ MES PROPOSITIONS DE CHANGEMENT DU SUJET DANS LE TEXTE.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LE RESUME EST RELATIVEMENT BIEN FAIT MAIS LES RESULTATS NE SONT PAS CLAIREMENT RESSORTIS.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
LE STYLE EST JOURNALISTIQUE ET NON SOCIOLOGIQUE, IL N'Y A PAS BEAUCOUP DE FAUTES D'ORTHOGRAPHE. CEPENDANT, UN PETIT EFFORT DOIT ETRE FOURNI PAR L'AUTEUR AFIN D'AMELIORER SON TEXTE DU POINT DE VUE GRAMMATICAL.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
LES METHODES SONT BIEN CHOISIES MAIS LEUR APPLICATION DANS LE TRAVAIL POSE BROBLEME. L'AUTEUR VA APPRECIER MES OBSERVATIONS POUR L'AMELIORATION DU CONTENU DE SON TEXTE.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
LE CHERCHEUR EST RESTE SUPERFICIEL DANS LA PRESENTATION DES RESULTATS. S'IL VEUT GARDER LES RESULTATS DE SON ARTICLE COMME TELS, IL FAUT ALORS OBLIGATOIREMENT REVISER LE TITRE.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LES CONCLUSIONS NE SONT PAS BIEN APPUYEES PAR LE CONTENU ; UN PETIT EFFORT DOIT ETRE FOURNI POUR ARRIVER A UNE BONNE CONCLUSION.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LES REFERENCES SONT BIEN PRESENTEES ET APPROPRIEES.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

J'encourage l'Auteur pour les efforts fournis en vue de la production de ce papier. Néanmoins je l'invite à multiplier les efforts pour améliorer la qualité de son travail en utilisant le langage sociologique et surtout en faisant parler la théorie choisie pour analyser son phénomène.

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: N'GUESSAN Tenguel Sosthene	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 juin 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 juin 2021
Manuscript Title: MODES DE GESTION ET DEGRADATION DE L'HABITAT SOCIAL A ABIDJAN (COTE D'IVOIRE) : CAS DES COPROPRIETES SOGEFIHA D'ABOBO ET SICOGI D'ADJAME	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0661/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input 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
<i>Le titre est clair et compréhensible. Il est en accord avec les résultats présentés</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé manque de consistance. La conclusion semble être un constat et</i>	

<i>n'apporte pas des informations nouvelles quant à gestion de l'environnement des populations.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
RAS	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Les techniques de collecte de données sont peu explicites et la théorie explicative peu documentée. Elle ne permet pas cerner son lien entre l'objet de la réflexion.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion reprend ce qui est dit dans le corps du texte et la discussion. Quels sont les principaux enseignements de l'étude ? Quelles en sont les implications aux plans social, scientifique, etc. ?</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Les titres développés dans les résultats sont identiques à ceux présentés dans la discussion. Les auteurs gagneraient à approfondir la réflexion pour mettre en évidence les idées forces à discuter et non à les répéter.

La conclusion reprend quasi totalement les phrases écrites dans les lignes antérieures. Veuillez faire ressortir à ce niveau du travail, les enseignements ou leçons apprises qui ressortent de l'étude.