

Paper: “Application de la géomatique et de l’analyse multicritère à l’analyse du risque d’inondation dans la ville d’Agboville (Sud de la Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 07 June 2024

Accepted: 19 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: Kangah Armand

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p87](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p87)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Marleine Aboumgone
Université Omar Bongo, Gabon

Reviewer 3: Philippes Mbevo
University of Douala, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. Aboumgone Obame Suzy Marleine	
University/Country: Université Omar Bongo, Gabon	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 juin 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 04 juillet 2024
Manuscript Title: Application de la géomatique et de l'analyse multicritère à la cartographie du risque d'inondation dans la ville d'Agboville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0651/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui	

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.	2
<i>Le titre est clair, mais il faut reformuler en retirant cartographie. Aussi, il faudra ajouter "en Côte d'Ivoire".</i> Application de la géomatique et de l'analyse multicritère à l'analyse du risque d'inondation dans la ville d'Agboville en Côte d'Ivoire	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>L'objectif, la méthode de collecte de données et les résultats sont clairement présentés.</i>	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Il y a plusieurs erreurs à corriger, vous les verrez sur le document</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie est clairement présentée</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont bien présentés</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La conclusion est à améliorer. Elle ne synthétise pas correctement les objectifs, les méthodes, les résultats et les perspectives.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Il y a plusieurs références, mais elles ne sont pas présentées en ordre alphabétique. Plusieurs auteurs cités dans le texte ne sont pas représentés en bibliographie. Il n'y a pas de webographie.</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):

Nous vous conseillons de faire attention aux fautes et aux accords. Faites un effort de rédaction, car d'autres personnes à travers le monde liront vos articles. Appliquez vous. Les sources de tableaux et autres ne sont pas renseignées. Toutefois, nous apprécions les aspects techniques du travail et surtout la thématique, car les résultats de cette étude seront un vrai outil d'aide à la décision. Il faudra le préciser dans votre conclusion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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:	
University/Country: University of Douala, Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/27/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/30/2024
Manuscript Title: Application de la géomatique et de l'analyse multicritère à la cartographie du risque d'inondation dans la ville d'Agboville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0651/24	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Not all the key results are included in the summary. This is regrettable, given that the author has quite a few quantified results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The text contains a number of grammatical and spelling errors. This reflects a certain carelessness on the part of the author. I have underlined a few of them, but the author needs to re-read his entire text to correct these errors, which are currently lowering the standard of the article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The author presents the methodological approach well, reflecting his mastery of the subject. The only regret is the lack of precision in the choice of ratings attributed to each flood factor.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are well rendered. The only thing to note is that the text on the figures is not legible and that the output does not fully comply with cartographic standards.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is fairly well rendered, it's just important to emphasize the scope of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The reference has some weaknesses: the author sometimes separates the publication date from the title with a full stop, sometimes with a comma. I think this needs to be harmonized. Also, such an article with only thirteen references is inconceivable.	

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):

For the article to be more accurate, it needs to be proofread thoroughly to correct grammatical and spelling errors; the theoretical framework needs to be broadened because you are dealing with an issue that is well documented in the scientific literature. You also need to improve the quality of your figures to make them more readable.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: