

Paper: “Le Conseil Regional du Tchologo Face au Defi d’Accessibilite a l’Eau et l’Electricite dans le Departement de Kong (Nord-Cote d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 20 August 2022

Accepted: 21 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Koffi Norbert Konan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n35p105](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n35p105)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Diané Lucien Adou

Université Jean Lorougon Guédé, Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: 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!

Reviewer Name: Diané Lucien ADOU	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougou Guédé, Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 29.10.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 02.11.2022
Manuscript Title: LE CONSEIL REGIONAL DU TCHOLOGO FACE AU DEFID'ACCESSESSIBILITE DES SERVICES SOCIAUX DE BASE : L'EAU ET L'ELECTRICITE DANS LE DEPARTEMENT DE KONG (NORD-COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	3

Le titre est long et redondant. On pourrait le simplifier par : « Le conseil régional du Tchologo face au défi de l'accessibilité à l'eau et à l'électricité dans le département de Kong (Nord de la Côte d'Ivoire) ».

The title is long and redundant. It could be simplified by: «The Tchologo Regional Council facing the challenge of access to water and electricity in the department of Kong (North of the Ivory Coast)».

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

2

Le résumé mérite d'être mieux structuré. Objectif général insuffisamment précis, Objectif spécifique 3 nous semble inapproprié. Méthode à mieux clarifier. Résultats bien présents conformément à la vision de l'auteur.

The summary deserves to be better structured. General objective insufficiently precise, Specific objective 3 seems inappropriate to us. Method to be better clarified. Results well present according to the vision of the author.

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

4

Si le texte contient relativement peu d'erreurs grammaticales rendant sa lecture aisée, l'auteur gagnerait à simplifier son langage qui frise le pédantisme.

If the text contains relatively few grammatical errors making it easy to read, the author would benefit from simplifying his language that borders on pedantry.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.

2

L'introduction de l'auteur n'en est véritablement pas une. L'état des lieux des écrits qui pullulent sur cette question est très plat. Même si le nombre d'auteurs convoqués ne confère pas forcément la qualité de l'idée, en avoir seulement deux pour une telle problématique nous semble trop insuffisant. L'introduction mérite une refonte.

La méthodologie souffre d'éléments pertinents. La zone d'étude est très sommairement présentée. La justification des personnes ressources est inexistante. Les populations bénéficiant des actions de développement ne sont pas consultées pour l'appréciation desdites actions.

The author's introduction is really not one of them. The state of play of the writings that abound on this issue is very flat. Even if the number of authors summoned does not necessarily confer the quality of the idea, having only two for such a problem seems too insufficient. The introduction deserves a redesign.

The methodology has relevant elements. The study area is very succinctly presented. There is no justification for contacts. The populations benefiting from development actions shall not be consulted for the assessment of those actions.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

3

Les résultats annoncés par l'auteur y sont. Cependant, le déficit de leur pertinence réside en la convocation des actions de l'action publique. L'étude aurait dû

<p><i>ressortir les contraintes des acteurs décentralisés. L'étude aurait dû mettre en relief le niveau de satisfaction des populations.</i></p> <p>The results announced by the author are there. However, the deficit of their relevance lies in convening the actions of public action. The study should have highlighted the constraints of decentralized actors. The study should have highlighted the level of satisfaction of populations.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p><i>Les idées de la sections « discussion » sont à mieux structurer. L'auteur fait une juxtaposition d'idées pas forcément liées en loin des résultats de l'étude. Il avance des résultats qui n'apparaissent nullement dans le texte, ou y apparaissent très insuffisamment. C'est le cas des contraintes des autorités décentralisées et de celui du niveau de satisfaction des populations.</i></p> <p>Ideas in the discussion section need to be better structured. The author makes a juxtaposition of ideas not necessarily related away from the results of the study. He advances results that do not appear in the text, or appear very insufficiently. This is the case with the constraints of the decentralized authorities and the level of satisfaction of the populations.</p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>Les références convoquées par l'auteur y sont. Elles respectent les exigences en la matière, sous réserve qu'elles cadrent avec celles de ESJ.</i></p> <p>The references requested by the author are there. They meet the relevant requirements, provided they are consistent with those of ESJ.</p>	

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):

Refer to the notifications in the grid.

Se référer aux notifications présentées dans la grille.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: