

Manuscript: “**Vulnérabilité De La Commune Urbaine De Mopti Aux Inondations**”

Submitted: 19 August 2021

Accepted: 17 November 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Abdoukadi Toure

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p37

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Dembele, Point Sud, Research Centre for Local Knowledge, Bamako -Mali

Reviewer 2: Dr KOUASSI N’Guessan Fabrice, University Alassane Ouattara/ 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!

Reviewer Name: Oumar DEMBELE, PhD	
University/Country: Point Sud, Research Centre for Local Knowledge, Bamako -Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Vulnérabilité des populations de la commune urbaine de Mopti aux évènements pluviométriques et hydriques extrêmes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0917/21	
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
The title is related to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The abstract is clear. The objects, methods and results are clearly presented.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are few grammatical errors, and few spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methods of the paper are clearly explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results of the document are clear and do not contain any errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are clear and appropriate.	

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):

Very interesting research.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments.

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 KOUASSI N'Guessan Fabrice	
University/Country : University Alassane Ouattara/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:25/08/ 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Vulnérabilité des populations de la commune urbaine de Mopti aux évènements pluviométriques et hydriques extrêmes	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17.09.2021	
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.	2
Le titre n'est adapté au contenu de l'article. En effet, la population qui est au centre de votre étude a été ignorée dans l'étude. Alors, le sujet devrait être: "Vulnérabilité de la commune urbaine de Mopti aux évènements pluviométriques et hydriques extrêmes")	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Les résultats sont partiellement présentés. En effet, les résultats évoquent les caractères des aléas climatiques ! Nous ne percevons pas les aspects de la vulnérabilité de la population! C'est à dire la sensibilité... le degré d'exposition de la population aux aléas, etc.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>L'usage des pronoms personnels, les longues phrases et l'absence d'une démarche argumentative cohérente altèrent le sens grammatical dans l'article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
L'approche méthodologique affiche une certaine cohérence. Cependant, il existe plusieurs insuffisances. Aucune approche de terrain n'a été présentée dans cette	

étude. Alors que cela était indispensable dans l'analyse de la vulnérabilité.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
La grande faiblesse de cet article est perçue dans la présentation des résultats. En effet, la présentation des résultats ne respecte aucune logique (numérotation, surcharge de l'article par la panoplie d'éléments présentés, des titres non expressifs du contenu du texte, etc...). La trame argumentative n'est pas perçue. Il faut réorganiser.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
La discussion est acceptable avec quelques insuffisances à corriger. Toutefois, la conclusion est à reprendre intégralement selon les suggestions de cette instruction	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Les notions élémentaires de présentation d'une références bibliographiques sont foulées aux pieds (nombre de page, lieu d'édition, etc...)	

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):

L'article sur la Vulnérabilité des populations de la commune urbaine de Mopti aux évènements pluviométriques et hydriques extrêmes repose sur les outils d'analyse climatologique intéressants. Cependant, les insuffisances méthodologiques et la présentation des résultats écorchent la qualité du travail. Nous suggérons une sérieuse revision des commentaires afin d'améliorer la qualité de l'article compte tenu des enjeux socioéconomiques de cette étude.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'article regorge des enjeux majeurs pour la science dans la mesure où les résultats donnent des pistes de réflexion dans le contexte actuel d'adaptation aux phénomènes naturels. Ainsi, les éditeurs doivent veiller à l'amélioration du contenu de cet article (approche méthodologique et résultats).