

Paper: “**Logiques Sociales du Deficit de Gouvernance Sanitaire des Produits Vivriers au Sein des Marchés Gouro d’Adjame Roxy et de Cocovico (Cote d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 31 August 2023

Accepted: 15 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Zamble Lou Tinan Paule Emile Bénédicte

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n31p104

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fulbert Tra
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: 25/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/09/2023
Manuscript Title: LOGIQUES SOCIALES DU DEFICIT DE GOUVERNANCE SANITAIRE DES PRODUITS VIVRIERS AU SEIN DES MARCHES GOURO D'ADJAME ROXY ET DE COCOVICO (COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0928/23	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>L'auteur n'a pas beaucoup lu et a utilisé certaines références qui sont vieilles.</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):

Le document ne contient point : l'unité d'observation et échantillonnage ; les données collectées aux près des enquêtés ; les outils et les techniques de collecte de données ; la taille de l'échantillon.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 19/10/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/10/2023
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL LOGICS OF THE LACK OF HEALTH GOVERNANCE OF FOOD PRODUCTS WITHIN THE GOURO MARKETS OF ADJAME ROXY AND COCOVICO (IVORY COAST)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0928/23	
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
The title is concise and embeds the heuristic field of the study (social dynamics) and (governance of live seafood products). The title is also specific as the geographical	

<p>area is clearly indicated (Adjamé market in Côte d'Ivoire). In short, it meets the criteria required for a scientific article.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The abstract is clear in that it outlines the study's objective, which is to provide insights into the social dynamics related to the health governance of these markets. It also suggests a qualitative research method (content analysis) and presents the associated data collection processes. Finally, the results are succinctly presented (This study reveals that the deficit in health governance in these social spaces can be explained by social constraints and social relationships between female traders and social institutions). However, it's worth noting that the way the results are stated may be a bit confusing due to the syntactic structure resembling a hypothesis.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Several grammatical errors have been identified in this article. We will highlight one as an example, among many others. Agreement errors are among the most important. "Considérés comme des denrées directement consommables, la commercialisation des produits..." Here, the verb "considérés" as an epithet in the sentence should agree in gender and number with the subject "commercialization." Thus, "considérés" should be written as "considérée." For the sake of brevity, there are similar errors of the same type throughout the different sections of the document. Secondly, we have also identified problems with verb conjugations and spelling. In short, a careful proofreading would help avoid such typos.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The methodological order presented by the author is coherent with the presentation of the data in the results and analysis. The author provides verbatim excerpts and conducts a content analysis of the discourse, as suggested since the introduction of the methodological framework. Furthermore, the data collected align with the nature of the study (qualitative study). There is, therefore, methodological consistency in the article.</p> <p>However, this type of study must necessarily incorporate a theoretical analytical framework (e.g., social interaction theory). As indicated, the theoretical analytical framework should be applied in the discussion section of the article. This theory, as presented by authors such as George Herbert Mead, Herbert Blumer, and Erving Goffman, is an approach to human relations that emphasizes the interaction between individuals. It is based on the idea that individuals are shaped by their interactions with others, and that these interactions are, in turn, shaped by the norms and values of the social group in which they occur.</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>The results are formally consistent with the methodology prescribed by the author. Indeed, the structure aligns with the progression of the text. The body of the text is supported by arguments and illustrated with verbatim excerpts in accordance with the qualitative approach. However, as we have already mentioned, the text is marred by grammatical, spelling, and conjugation errors. In this case, we invite the author to clean up the text through a thorough proofreading.</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
We recommend that the author maintain the logical order of presentation, avoiding the impact of numeration on the conclusion. Just as the heading "Introduction" does not include numbering, the heading "Conclusion" should not include it either. Furthermore, the conclusion should provide an overview of the study and the lessons learned from it. However, the methodological overview is not addressed here (What is the contribution in terms of specific theoretical knowledge that the theory of interaction has allowed us to achieve at the end of this study).	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The bibliography is consistent with the authors mentioned in the body of the text.	

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):

We recommend that the author carefully review the document from the introduction to the results in order to identify and correct any formatting errors and to integrate the framework of data analysis theory into the results. Overall, the work is well executed.

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: Fulbert TRA	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 0928/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/10/23
Manuscript Title: LOGIQUES SOCIALES DU DEFICIT DE GOUVERNANCE SANITAIRE DES PRODUITS VIVRIERS AU SEIN DES MARCHES GOURO D'ADJAME ROXY ET DE COCOVICO (COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.09.2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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

Le titre est particulièrement éloquent.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Cet article examine le déficit de gouvernance sanitaire des marchés de Roxy et Cocovico malgré les efforts d'assainissement des coopératives. L'analyse met en évidence les conflits d'intérêts entre commerçantes, institutions coopératives et municipales en raison de contraintes sociales, expliquant ainsi le déficit de gouvernance sanitaire dans ces espaces sociaux. La méthodologie inclut l'analyse de contenu thématique, la recherche documentaire, l'observation et des entretiens.</i> Le résumé est effectivement clair et bien structuré	
.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(La méthode de recherche tient compte à la fois du domaine géographique et des techniques de collecte de données d'enquête, ce qui la rend particulièrement adaptée à une étude sociologique.)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(L'étude présente des résultats solidement argumentés, analysés et interprétés de manière approfondie.)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
La conclusion de l'étude adresse de manière adéquate le problème initial de la recherche et réalise efficacement une synthèse des résultats	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Les références bibliographiques sont en cohérence avec le thème de recherche et sont présentées de manière soignée.)	

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):

Prendre en considération les observations mentionnées dans le texte.