

Paper: “Occupation des Zones à Risques à San-Pedro (Côte D’ivoire): Entre Laxisme des Autorités et Insouciance des Populations”

Submitted: 20 June 2022

Accepted: 25 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Yapi Atsé Calvin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n26p46](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n26p46)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cisse Cheikh Omar Tidjani
Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis du Sénégal

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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:2022/06/27	Date Review Report Submitted: 2022/07/27
Manuscript Title: Occupation des zones à risques à San-Pedro (Côte d'Ivoire) : entre laxisme des autorités et insouciance des populations	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0653/22	
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>	<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>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
There are many grammatical and spelling mistakes in this article. I began to correct some mistakes but the mistakes are too many.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Yes	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>No, there are some errors in this part of the article. See my comments in the text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Too much effort will be done to write correctly references. I mark in the text some errors.</i>	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is important to take in account the problem of language in this article. In order to enhance the quality of this paper, the authors must do too much effort in the redaction. If this article is published in this condition without review the grammatical and spelling errors, many lectors cannot understand this.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: 22.07.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 26.07.2022
Manuscript Title: Occupation des zones à risques à San-Pedro (Côte d’Ivoire) : entre laxisme des autorités et insouciance des populations	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 53_06_2022_	
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>	<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>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>la méthodologie reste à compléter</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le texte est correcte meme s'il y a encore des ameliorations à faire pour la coherence des idées</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La méthodologie doit etre complete par les techiques de traitement des images et statistiques descriptives utilisées</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont clairs et traduisent les attentes annoncées dans la problématique. Mais la discussion doit etre plus développée</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion aussi doit etre complétée</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Labibliographie mérite d'etre complétée jusqu'à 20 auteurs au moins</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):

L'auteur à le mérite de poser un problème environnemental recurrent dans les villes ouest africaines en utilisant des outils et methodes d'analyse modernes. Mais il faut un peu plus de details dans la méthodologie et les résultats pour valoriser le travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: RAS

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Cisse Cheikh Omar Tidjani	
University/Country: Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis du Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 juillet 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 juillet 2022
Manuscript Title: Occupation des zones à risques à San-Pedro (Côte d'Ivoire) : entre laxisme des autorités et insouciance des populations	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0653/22	
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

Yes, the title is very clear and corresponds to the content of the article. The problematic approached in this work is a current thematic.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes, the summary of the article is complete. It is just necessary to add laconically the methodological approach adopted for the land use.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The grammatical errors found in the correction are not significant.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology adopted in the work has been explained thoroughly and clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>In the first section of the results, the results could be better exploited. However, the survey data were well used.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Yes, the conclusions of the study are well supported by the content. But they must specify the scientific contribution of their work in the conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references cited are insufficient for an international article. They need to connect the discussion with other international studies. Numerous publications have been made on the occupation of risk areas in the world, especially in West Africa.</i>	

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):

I appreciated the quality of this work which brings capital information concerning the problems of development and occupation of the African cities like the city of San-Pedro. The results obtained must be valued by the urbanistic services for a better planning of the urban space.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: