

Manuscript: **“Etude De La Contribution Des Forages Dans L’amélioration De L’accès À L’eau Potable Dans Le Quartier De N’Tabacoro Cité Extension À Bamako”**

**Submitted: 10 July 2021**

**Accepted: 04 November 2021**

**Published: 30 November 2021**

Corresponding Author: Hamidou Diawara

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p106

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Evens Emmanuel

**Reviewer 2:** Raoufou Pierre Radji

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-07-29 04:34 AM

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Le titre de l'article n'est pas clair. Le relecteur demande aux auteurs de modifier le titre, et si possible d'adopter la formulation suivante:

"Étude de la contribution des forages dans l'amélioration de l'accès à l'eau potable dans le quartier de N'Tabakoro cité extension à Bamako"

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Cette section doit être revue dans la version révisée

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Le relecteur recommande aux auteurs de bien relire la version révisée avant de la soumettre.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

La méthodologie est bien développée

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

L'article accuse une importante déficience par rapport à la littérature scientifique sur l'approvisionnement privé en eau dans les quartiers défavorisés des pays du Sud.

Le relecteur soumet aux auteurs certaines références sur cette problématique. Il serait très pertinent de consulter des publications sur la théorie du cycle hydrosocial. En effet, les lecteurs seraient très intéressés à comprendre le poids des objets techniques (forages et objet de transport) ainsi que le jeu des acteurs dans le dispositif social de l'eau dans la zone d'étude.

Les travaux suivants pourraient être, sur le plan théorique, d'une grande utilité:

Linton, J. (2010) What is water?The history of a modern abstraction.Vancouver: UBC Press.

Linton, J., Budds, J. (2014). Thehydrosocial cycle: Defining and mobilizing a relational dialectical approach to water. Geoforum. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.10.008

Nuttle, W. K. (2002). Is ecohydrology one idea or many? Hydrological Sciences Journal, 47(5), 805-807. doi: 10.1080/02626660209492983.

Schmidt, J. J. (2014). Historicising the Hydrosocial Cycle. Water Alternatives, 7(1), 220-234. Disponible sur: [www.water-alternatives.org/index.php/alldoc/articles/vol7/v7issue1/242-a7-1-13/file](http://www.water-alternatives.org/index.php/alldoc/articles/vol7/v7issue1/242-a7-1-13/file)

Swyngedouw, E. (1999). Modernity and Hybridity: Nature, Regeneracionismo, and theProduction of the Spanish Waterscape, 1890-1903.Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 89(3), 443-465.doi: 10.1111/0004-5608.00157

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Il est conseillé aux auteurs de réviser la conclusion.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

**Raoufou Pierre Radji**

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-07-26 05:55 PM

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

\*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

\*

- Yes
- No

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear but the content is too descriptive without precise and concise results.

Problematic of the study is not well explained to let readers appreciate the issue of the study.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Methodology to be improved completely

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

More grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the manuscript

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Methods are too descriptive without

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Body of the paper contains fully errors

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion doesn't resume the study

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Insufficient for the study issue

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5



*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

\*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

\*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject