

Paper: “Processus de Vieillesse actif : cas des pratiques de protection sociale des travailleurs informels du secteur des transports routiers urbains d’Adjamé (commune d’Abidjan Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 24 October 2021

Accepted: 22 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Kouadio Christian Dapa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n19p95

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aristide Yemmafouo
University of Dschang, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Issa Fofana
Université des Sciences Sociales et de gestion de Bamako, Mali

Reviewer H:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, but can be settle like this "Vieillessement actif et pratiques de protection sociale des travailleurs informels du secteur des transports routiers urbains d'Adjamé (commune d'Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire)"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, but need spatial keyword

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

Yes, see inside the full text

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, qualitative methods is suitable

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

Yes, but it lacks synthetic analysis

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

To be improve, see comments in the text

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

A bit old, need to be actualize, looking for Anglo-Saxon's literature

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer L:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

Yes but long

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Important to add some findings to the abstract

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

the text needs to be re-read.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I don't see the protection services agents. the analysis is done on the basis of the actors' speeches only. there is no possibility to triangulate the speeches

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

Not enough

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

good

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

See comment

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
