

Paper: “Secteur Informel, Alternative au Sous-Emploi des Jeunes dans la Sous-Préfecture de Toumodi”

Submitted: 13 April 2023

Accepted: 17 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Dje Gnamian Gildas Gnepehi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p19](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p19)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moussa dit Martin Tessougue
Université des Sciences Sociales et de Gestion de Bamako, Mali

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Boubou Aldiouma Sy
Université Gaston BERGER (UGB) de Saint-Louis, Senegal

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: Dr TESSOUGUE Moussa dit Martin	
University/Country: Université des Sciences Sociales et de Gestion de Bamako (USSGB) au Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: April, 27, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: May 1 st 2023
Manuscript Title: Le secteur informel comme alternative au sous-emploi des jeunes dans la Sous-Préfecture de Toumodi	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.04.2023	
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
<i>The subject is consistent with the content of the text (Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>There is some confusion in the abstract. It is also too long (Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are many grammatical errors and much spelling mistakes in this article (Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Quantitative survey is not well done. In this part method can be explain more! (Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results can be better organized and supplemented. Indeed, beyond the analyzes of incomes among young people in urban areas, it is necessary to look at the results of the incomes of rural youth in the informal sector. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusion is to be redone by answering the research question, by determining if the object is reached and by giving the verification of the hypothesis. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The references are not comprehensive and appropriate. It is better to do another. (Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject is interesting in itself. The assignment shows deficiencies in the determination of the quantitative sample. The results must come exclusively from the field of study. It is in the discussion that we must appeal to national statistics.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

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>(The title is quite short and it is clear and adequate to the content of the text)</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.	4
<i>(I have directly integrated all the minor grammatical and spelling mistakes in the text)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(But it will be good if the authors could explain clearly in detail the meaning of choix raisonné in the method section)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The conclusion is too short, if the authors could recall some major findings in improving it)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The only thing the authors need to do is to strengthen their conclusion which is too short and does not remind to the reader the main contents of the text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Boubou Aldiouma SY	
University/Country: Université Gaston BERGER (UGB) de Saint-Louis/Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: le 27 Avril 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: le 8 Mai 2023
Manuscript Title: Secteur informel et emplois des jeunes dans la Sous-Préfecture de Toumodi en Côte d'Ivoire (Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.04.2023	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [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). J'ai proposé une reformulation plus simple du titre</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments). Oui l'article répond globalement aux normes de présentation d'une contribution scientifique</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments). Quelques maladroresses ont été relevées.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments). C'est bon</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments). Les résultats et les discussions sont acceptables</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments). Oui c'est bon</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments). La bibliographie est pertinente</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: