

Paper: “« L’Ebeb » un Structurant Endogène de Quête de la Longévité et de la Retraite Active en Pays « Lodjukru » (Dabou-Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 11 August 2021

Accepted: 04 November 2021

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Dayoro Zoguéhi Arnaud Kévin

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n28p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N’guessan Tenguel Sosthene
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Mamam S. Toleba
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Ndabarushimana Alexis
National School of Administration, Burundi

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. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 19.08.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.08.21
Manuscript Title: L'Ebeb, un structurant endogène de quête de la longévité et de la retraite active en pays Lodjukru, (Dabou-Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---70.08.2021---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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 peut mieux faire.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les Auteurs ont fourni un effort de collecte des informations nécessaires à la rédaction du papier, mais beaucoup de coquilles sont laissées dans le document.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<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'Examinateur.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Conclusion acceptable mais peut mieux faite.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bibliographie acceptable mais à améliorer dans le texte en conformité avec les orientations de l'Examinateur.</i>	

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'Examinateur !

Bon courage à l'Auteur.

(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.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 18 th August 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 1 st September 2021
Manuscript Title: « <i>L'Ebeb</i> », un structurant endogène de quête de la longévité et de la retraite active en pays Lodjukru, (Dabou-Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0870/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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>Il manque seulement le problème présenté brièvement</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Les fautes ne sont pas nombreuses (Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Ok (Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats sont bien présentés mais ne sont discutés (Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La conclusion manque les parties essentielles telles qu'indiquées dans le texte (Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les références n'ont pas respecté le style APA (Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le sujet est très intéressant mais tu sembles vouloir le traiter très rapidement sans prendre suffisamment de temps pour poser d'abord clairement le problème

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: N'GUESSAN TENGUEL SOSTHENE	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua/Cote d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 août 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04 septembre 2021
Manuscript Title: « L'Ebeb », un structurant endogène de quête de la longévité et de la retraite active en pays Lodjukru, (Dabou-Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0870/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La proposition suggérée n'est pas impérative mais souhaitable.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: