

Paper: “**Dynamique Urbaine et Litiges Fonciers à Toumodi (Centre-Sud de la Côte d’Ivoire)**”

**Submitted: 06 June 2023**

**Accepted: 22 September 2023**

**Published: 30 September 2023**

Corresponding Author: Dje Gnamian Gildas Gnepehi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p72

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouao Styvince

Université jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Yapi Atse Calvin

Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d’Ivoire

# 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: Dr. KOUAO N'kpomé Styvance Romaric	
University/Country: Université jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa en Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 8 june 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 june 2023
Manuscript Title: Dynamique urbaine et risque de litiges fonciers dans la ville de Toumodi (Centre-Sud de la Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.---42.06.2023(1)	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

The title matches the content of the text. It is quite original because it deals with an aspect rarely studied in issues related to urban land.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
The abstract clearly presents the context, the research methodology. However, the results of the study are not clearly presented.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The article has fewer grammatical and spelling errors. However, some spelling and style errors were noted. However, this does not affect the editorial quality of the text.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The study methods are not well explained because the data and methods part of the article was poorly written. An effort to organize this part must be made, to put order in this part. Next, the methodology for studying the risk of land disputes was not explained.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The results do not contain errors. However, some key findings from the article have not been exposed. These are the results relating to the mapping of the distribution of the level of risk of land disputes.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
YES! The conclusions of the results are accurate and reflect the content of the study	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Yes! The references are appropriate and comprehensive.	

**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):**

The article is accepted, but corrections must be made before publication. These corrections concern the summary, the presentation of data and methods, the insertion of a result dealing with the distribution of the level of risk of land disputes and especially the discussion. It is necessary to refer to the comments mentioned by the instructor in the article.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The article is accepted subject to the corrections mentioned in the text. Also, the author must comply with the editorial standards of the journal.

# 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: 09/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/08/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Dynamique urbaine et risques de litiges fonciers dans la ville de Toumodi (Centre-Sud de la Côte d'Ivoire)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0642/23</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Oui le titre est clair et est cohérence avec le contenu. C'est un sujet d'actualité, car en Côte d'Ivoire tout comme dans les pays en développement d'une manière générale, les litiges fonciers qui étaient perceptibles en milieu rural se sont</i>	

<i>désormais récurrents en milieu urbain. C'est la raison pour laquelle, plusieurs auteurs s'intéressent à la question pour apporter quelques pistes de solution</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
1. <i>Oui le résumé est pas complét. Cependant, l'auteur devrait commencer par la contextualisation de son problème au lieu de situer la ville de Toumodi.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Le niveau en grammaire est bon, malgré quelques coquilles</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(La méthodologie adoptée a des faiblesses) En effet, la technique pour déterminer son échantillonnage, manque de clarté</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(les résultats ne sont si bien présentés dans l'ensemble)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La conclusion est un tout peu brève. Elle mérite d'être renforcée.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La bibliographie doit être présentée conformément à la note aux auteurs.</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 le mérite de soulever d'abord l'un des problèmes cruciaux rencontrés dans les villes ivoiriennes. Le foncier, le substrat de toute activité humaine est l'objet de litige et aucune ville n'est épargnée. Toutefois, dans l'introduction, l'auteur devrait insérer le problème de recherche et d'autres objectifs spécifiques conformément aux propositions faites dans le texte.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

L'auteur doit simplement prendre en compte les recommandations contenues dans le texte.

# 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: 14 juin 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 juin 2023
Manuscript Title: Dynamique urbaine et risque de litiges fonciers dans la ville de Toumodi (Centre-Sud de la Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 42-06-2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ <b>Yes</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(LE TITRE EST CLAIR ET PRECIS)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>(Le résumé est mal agencé ; quelques idées intéressantes y figurent toutefois. La méthodologie est mal présentée ; il n'y a pas de résultats saillants)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>(L'article enregistre plusieurs fautes ; les phrases sont mal formulées ; l'usage des connecteurs logiques n'est pas maîtrisé. Cela donne l'impression que les auteurs n'ont pas pris le soin de relire le manuscrit avant soumission)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(la méthodologie manque de claret; besoin de la circonscrire)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Les résultats manquent de pertinence dans le discours. Les idées sont mal organisées et vont dans tous les sens. Certaines illustrations comme la figure 2 sont inappropriées ; Il n'y a pas de cohérence dans le discours. Besoin d'organisation en profondeur. La discussion a besoin d'être réorganisée)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(La conclusion n'est pas bien présentée ; quelques bonnes idées y figurent mais, mal agencées)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Besoin de se référer à la note aux auteurs pour la présentation de la bibliographie)</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'article nécessite des corrections importantes ; accorder beaucoup de soin à l'utilisation des connecteurs logiques qui ont pour but d'assurer une cohérence dans le discours. Se relire au maximum pour extraire les fautes. Il n'y a pas de fil conducteur ; les idées affluent dans tous les sens ; certaines d'entre elles sont parachutées sans lien en amont.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**