

Paper: “Genre et Acces au Foncier : Etude Comparative des Modes d’Acquisition de la Terre chez les Femmes du Sud et du Nord de la Cote d’Ivoire : Cas d’Akoupé et Becouéfin ; Nahoualakaha et Torgokaha”

Submitted: 07 November 2021

Accepted: 13 January 2022

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: Hamza Salih

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n2p52](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n2p52)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Koffi Koffi Gnamien JC
University Félix Houphouet-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Gacha Franck-Gautier
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Mamam S. Toléba
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

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: Koffi Koffi Gnamien JC	
University/Country: University Félix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021/11/12	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/11/2021
Manuscript Title: GENDER AND ACCESS TO LAND: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LAND ACQUISITION MODES AMONG WOMEN in the South and North of Côte d'Ivoire: Case of Akoupé and Becouéfin; Nahoualakaha and Torgokaha	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 01	
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> The content reflects the title of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Very clearly	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The text does not contain grammar et other errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The authors should highlight the theory mobilized to address the question	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> acceptable	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The relationship is expressive	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>exact</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):

The authors should highlight the theory mobilized to address the question.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article in its current state can be validly published.

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: GACHA Franck-Gautier	
University/Country: Université Peleforo GON COULIBALY de Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 13-11-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28-11-2021
Manuscript Title: GENRE ET ACCES AU FONCIER : ETUDE COMPARATIVE DES MODES D'ACQUISITION DE LA TERRE CHEZ LES FEMMES DU SUD ET DU NORD DE LA COTE D'IVOIRE : Cas d'Akoupé et Becouéfin ; Nahoualakaha et Torgokaha	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1154/21	
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>Juste une petite modification. Voir texte</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Observations à voir dans le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Rien à signaler</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):

Prendre en compte les observations faites dans le corps du texte.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Merci à ESJ de contribuer à l'avancée des questions scientifiques à travers le monde.

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. Ir. Mamam S. TOLÉBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.11.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/12/21
Manuscript Title: Genre et accès au foncier : étude comparative des modes d'acquisition de la terre chez les femmes du Sud et du Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire : cas d'Akoupé et Becouéfin ; Nahoualakaha et Torgokaha	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 54.11.2021	
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.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le titre correspond au développement de la recherche mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est acceptable mais à améliorer en tenant compte des observations de l'Évaluateur.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>L'Auteur a fourni un effort de collecte des informations nécessaires à la rédaction du papier, mais beaucoup de coquilles sont laissées dans le document. Se faire relire souvent avant l'envoi du texte à une revue.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Acceptable mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>L'Auteur a fait un grand effort dans la collecte des informations. La structuration des idées manque d'un peu de concentration. Des défauts de style et autres à régulariser. Se conformer aux instructions de l'Examineur.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Conclusion acceptable mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bibliographie à améliorer dans le texte en conformité avec les orientations de l'Examineur.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

L'Auteur a fait un effort de collecte d'informations, mais il reste une structuration dans la rédaction. Tenir compte des observations de l'Examineur !

Bon courage.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

L'Auteur est prié de revisiter le document de "Méthodologie de rédaction d'articles scientifiques", en vue de se conformer à certaines règles de rédaction.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Le document peut être accepté sous réserve de reprise et intégration des observations faites par l'Examineur.