

**Paper: “Droits des Enfants dans le Programme Scolaire au Primaire en Cote d’Ivoire et Leurs Perceptions par les Enseignants”**

**Submitted: 12 August 2021**

**Accepted: 11 October 2021**

**Published: 31 October 2021**

Corresponding Author: Ouattara K. Insiata Epse Goita

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p263](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p263)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raphael Kelani

Ecole Normale Supérieure de Natitingou, UNSTIM, Benin

Reviewer 2: Sharll Kouamé Ackoundoun-Nguessan

Ecole Normale Supérieure (ENS), Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ***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: Kelani Raphael	
University/Country: Ecole Normale Supérieure de Natitingou, UNSTIM/Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/08/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>DROITS DES ENFANTS DANS LE PROGRAMME SCOLAIRE AU PRIMAIRE EN COTE D'IVOIRE ET LEURS PERCEPTIONS PAR LES ENSEIGNANTS</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 74.08.2021	
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>5</b>

<i>Le titre est très clair et traduit bien le contenu du texte</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Le résumé de l'article est assez clair aussi et comporte les différentes parties appropriées. Cependant la traduction en langue anglaise (Abstract) doit être améliorée. Des suggestions ont été faites.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>La rédaction du texte est parfait et assez explicite, sans fautes majeures; quelques erreurs de saisie cependant.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La démarche méthodologique est à revoir.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Les résultats et la discussion sont assez bien exposés. Il n'y a pas de commentaires à ce propos.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>La conclusion et les résumés reflètent bien le contenu du texte</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les references bibliographiques sont assez vieilles; mais tout a fait appropriées.</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):**

Le texte est bien rédigé mettant en exergue la capacité rédactionnelle de l'auteur.  
 La problématique doit être revue. Il est important de faire appel à des articles récents.  
 En effet, l'auteur gagnerait à étoffer son texte avec des publications de moins de 10 ans afin de le rendre excellent.  
 La démarche méthodologique est à revoir aussi.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Le thème relative aux droits des enfants dans les programmes scolaire au primaire est très actuel et d'un grand intérêt pour la communauté scientifique.  
**Ceci est un article très bien rédigé nécessitant des corrections mineures**

# 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: Ackoundoun-Nguessan Kouamé Sharll	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/09/2021
Manuscript Title: DROITS DES ENFANTS DANS LE PROGRAMME SCOLAIRE AU PRIMAIRE EN COTE D'IVOIRE ET LEURS PERCEPTIONS PAR LES ENSEIGNANTS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0874/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## 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>

Le titre cadre avec le contenu de l'article.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
Le résumé est tient compte en partie des méthodes utilisées, et les résultats obtenus	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Quelques erreurs relevées. Voir dans le texte, elles sont mises en rouge.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
L'auteur doit clairement poser le problème pour permettre de suivre la méthodologie qui doit être plus explicite. Nous notons l'absence de cadre théorique pour mettre en évidence l'intérêt des termes à mobiliser et discuter les relations ou les articulations possibles entre ces termes.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
Approche méthodologique : nous notons que le manque de question de recherche ne permet pas une bonne approche. A cela, il faut ajouter l'absence d'un plan d'analyse pour identifier clairement les objets d'observation et d'analyse, et faciliter une meilleure présentation des résultats. En conséquence, nous relevons le manque de rigueur dans le traitement méthodologique des données, et une insuffisance au niveau de l'articulation entre la présentation des résultats et l'interprétation des données recueillies. Les résultats obtenus ne sont pas discutés. La limite de validité des résultats n'est pas aussi discutée.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
La conclusion est adaptée au contenu. Les propositions sont assez pertinentes pour une amélioration de l'enseignement des droits de l'enfant à l'enseignement primaire.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Les références bibliographiques sont complètes, appropriées et bien fournies. Cependant, il doit tenir compte des travaux encore plus récents: Hanson, K. (2012). School of thought in children's rights. In M. Liebel, <i>Children's rights from below : Cross cultural perspectives</i> (p. 63-79). New York, NY : Palgrave Macmillan. Le Gal, J. (2008). <i>Les droits de l'enfant à l'école : pour une éducation à la citoyenneté</i> . Bruxelles, Belgique : De Boeck. Louviot, M. (2017). L'enseignement interdisciplinaire au service des droits de l'enfant. <i>Enjeux pédagogiques</i> , 29, 30-31.	

**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):**

L'auteur doit éviter de traduire directement le résumé dans google translate.

Le travail doit être réorganisé pour apparaître l'introduction et être conforme à l'IMRAD recommandée par la revue.

Donner clairement les résultats obtenus aussi bien au niveau de l'analyse des programmes qu'au niveau des perceptions des enseignants. Les analyser puis les discuter.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**Le travail est intéressant. L'auteur gagnerait à tenir compte des observations notées.**

# ***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: August 18, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 10, September 2021
<b>Manuscript Title: DROITS DES ENFANTS DANS LE PROGRAMME SCOLAIRE AU PRIMAIRE EN COTE D'IVOIRE ET LEURS PERCEPTIONS PAR LES ENSEIGNANTS</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0874/21	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [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>The title is well suited to the subject.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The summary is very explicit, both in terms of methods and results.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>See attached file</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The study methods are appropriately described.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The body of the document is clear and correctly written</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion is supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The bibliography need to be reinforced by other scientific references.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

In this paper, the authors describe a content analysis of master guides and semi-structured interviews with 12 teachers shows that, while children's rights are taken into account in the formal curriculum. The authors note a divergence of views in the perception of those who are in charge of providing them.

The work presented remains original since, in terms of plagiarism assessment, only about 15% of this document consists of text more or less similar to the content of 96 sources considered most relevant. The largest section with similarities contains 58 words and has a similarity index of 90% with its main source. The text is written in a good and comprehensive French. I believe this is an interesting contribution and I recommend for publication in ESJ after a minor revision.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

In this paper, the authors describe a content analysis of master guides and semi-structured interviews with 12 teachers shows that, while children's rights are taken into



account in the formal curriculum. The authors note a divergence of views in the perception of those who are in charge of providing them.

The work presented remains original since, in terms of plagiarism assessment, only about 15% of this document consists of text more or less similar to the content of 96 sources considered most relevant. The largest section with similarities contains 58 words and has a similarity index of 90% with its main source. The text is written in a good and comprehensive French. I believe this is an interesting contribution and I recommend for publication in ESJ after a minor revision.