

Paper: “Retour d’emigration, Enjeux Fonciers et Defi de Developpement a Zoukougbeu et Gregbeu (Centre-Ouest, Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 30 March 2021

Accepted: 05 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Kouassi Ernest Yao

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p236](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p236)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: N'dri Celestin Koffi
Université Alassane de Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Lassina Kone
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Cote d'Ivoire

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: KOFFI N'Dri Célestin	
University/Country: Université Alassane de Bouaké/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: RETOUR D'EMIGRATION, ENJEUX FONCIERS ET DEFI DE DEVELOPPEMENT A ZOUKOUGBEU (CENTRE-OUEST, CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0434/21	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le sujet est clair et compréhensible	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est clair, mais, il faut donner certains détails au niveau de la méthodologie</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> RAS	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>C'est bien menée, mais, il faut certains détails pour une meilleure compréhension</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats sont clairs, mais, il faut varier les auteurs</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>RAS</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>C'est bien, seulement qu'il faut revoir les vieux auteurs</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):

Revoir l'année de publication de quelques auteurs (les plus vieilles: avant 2010), la discussion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: RAS

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 10 june 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 june 2021
Manuscript Title: RETOUR D'EMIGRATION, ENJEUX FONCIERS ET DEFIL DE DEVELOPPEMENT A ZOUKOUGBEU (CENTRE-OUEST, CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0434/2021	
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.	3

<i>The title should be modified as:</i> RETOUR D'EMIGRATION, ENJEUX FONCIERS ET DEFI DE DEVELOPPEMENT A ZOUKOUGBEU ET GREBEU (CENTRE-OUEST, CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The manuscript pagination starts from 9. Is there an explanation of that?</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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>The conclusion need to relate what have been understood at Zoukougbeu and Grebeu and then open the debate to the Africa as well. Actually, only the second part is well dressed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Some authors name need correction: Ouattara instead of Outtara.</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):

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: KONE LASSINA	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny/Cote d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 07juin2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17juin2021
Manuscript Title: Return from Emigration, Land issues and Development challenge in Zoukougbeu (Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0434/21	
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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre est Clair et présente des concepts adéquats à une étude sociologique	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Tous les aspects de la méthodologie sont inclus. C'est bon.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Quelques fautes grammaticales et des expressions à revoir.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La méthode est bonne	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les résultats sont bien élucidés et peu de fautes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>La conclusion est parfaite</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les références sont dans les normes du CAMES donc bien	

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):

Article respectant la méthodologie appropriée, mais revoir les fautes et les coquilles.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: