

Paper: “Enjeux et Défis de l’Intercommunalité au Sénégal : Observation à Partir du Niombato, Région de Fatick”

Submitted: 18 July 2023

Accepted: 21 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Mohamadou Mountaga Diallo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n23p102](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n23p102)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Gildas Gnepéhi

Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Kasimou Tiamiyu

University Norbert Zongo of Koudougou, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 4: Ornelle Tiomo

Université de Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: GNEPEHI DJE GNAMAIN GILDAS	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE ALASSANE OUATTARA DE BOUAKE/ COTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 04 AOUT 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Enjeux et défis de l'intercommunalité au Sénégal : observation à partir de l'intercommunalité de Niombato	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0803/23	
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.	3
<i>It contains clerical errors to be corrected. (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>The data and methods do not present the different parts. He first presents the data, then the collection methods and finally the processing method. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are interesting but will have to be better organized and the figures well presented. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusion is not the synthesis of review of the literature. She would benefit from being better organized. (Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

The subject is interesting in itself. Authors should refer to the review template. The introduction and the data and methods will have to be repeated.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 2023-08-03	Date Review Report Submitted: 2023-08-06
Manuscript Title: Enjeux et défis de l'intercommunalité au Sénégal : observation à partir de l'intercommunalité de Niombato	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38	
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.	5
Titre en adéquations avec le contenu du document	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

Résumé acceptable	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Texte conforme aux règles grammaticales	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Méthodologie et conforme à l'étude. Toutefois, les auteurs sont invités à faire le choix d'une marge d'erreur adaptée à l'étude car ils en ont énuméré 3 dans l'échantillonnage	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Résultats très bien menés mais le texte semble être un peu touffu	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Conclusion est à revoir tout en prenant soin de retirer les nombreuses citations d'auteurs	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Référence bibliographique conforme au texte	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Se référer au texte originel pour apporter les corrections aux suggestions énumérées

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comet

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: TIAMIYU Kasimou	
University/Country: University Norbert ZONGO of Koudougou/ Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Issues and challenges of intercommunality in Senegal: observation based on the Niombato intercommunality	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0803/23	
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.	4
<i>Titre clair et précis et reflète le contenu du manuscrit</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Le résumé est bien élaboré. Les différentes parties (context, méthodes et résultats) y sont bien distinguées</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Pas de commentaire</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Bien que la méthode d'échantillonnage ait été expliquée, la technique appliquée pour la repartition des enquêtés par commune n'a pas été élucidée. En plus, la méthodologie utilisée pour l'analyse de la dynamique spatiale de la commune de Karang Poste n'est pas expliquée. En effet, les techniques de traitement des données doivent être clairement détaillées de sorte que le lecteur qui veut reproduire la même chose puisse la faire.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>De petites confusions au niveau de la section 2.2.1 (fig.9)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est assez bien élaborée et débouche sur des recommandation pour le renforcement de l'intercommunalité</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont dans leur majorité anciennes. Moins de 50% en effet ont moins de cinq ans.</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):

L'introduction est bien élaborée. Elle clarifie bien les concept clés du manuscrit, notamment l'intercommunalité, le « territoire pertinent ». Elle a le mérite d'aborder les questions, hypothèses et objectifs de recherche. Cependant, l'ordre selon lequel ces élément sont convoqués peut être amélioré pour plus de cohérence. Plutôt que d'émettre l'hypothèse de recherche, présenter l'objectif de la recherche avant de poser les questions de recherche, il serait plus pertinent de poser les questions de recherche, émettre les hypothèses et présenter l'objectif de recherche; ou commencer par présenter l'objectif de recherche, poser les questions de recherches et finir avec les hypothèses.

Au niveau des résultats, la “**Fig.9 : Avis des populations sur la pertinence de l’intercommunalité de Niombato**” évalue-t-elle la pertinence de l’intercommunalité ou l’approbation/adhésion de la population au projet de l’intercommunalité ? le titre de la figure tel que donné et le commentaire qui en découle porte à confusion. Il y’a donc nécessité de lever cette confusion. En tout état de cause, nous suggérons que cette section aille au delà de l’approbation de la population au projet intercommunalité pour évaluer la perception de la population de la pertinence de l’intercommunalité. L’échelle de Likert pourrait être convoquée à cet effet. Vous pourriez avoir de la documentation en ligne pour en savoir plus. Je vous joint aussi un article qui pourrait vous inspirer dans ce sens.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: TIOMO Ornelle Rosine	
University/Country: Université de Yaoundé 1/ Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Enjeux et défis de l'intercommunalité au Sénégal : observation à partir de l'intercommunalité de Niombato	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38 – 03.08.2023	
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.

<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>Oui le titre es ten adequation avec le contenu du texte.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Oui, le résumé est clair et comprend les objectifs, la méthodologie utilisée et les résultats.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Très peu de fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie est assez claire et bien expliquée.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Il y'a une bonne logique et une cohérence dans le développement et la structuration des résultats.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est bien rédigée et est en lien logique avec le contenu présenté.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références sont bien présentées et contiennent des ouvrages assez récents en lien avec le sujet.</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):

- L'auteur devrait annoncer les illustrations de manière claire avant de les presenter.
- L'introduction devrait être revue et synthétisée du fait de sa longueur.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: