

Paper: “**Les concessions minières des compagnies industrielles à l’épreuve de l’exploitation artisanale clandestine: le cas de la mine d’or de Hiré, Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 04 July 2024

Accepted: 30 September 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Mory Diakite

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n29p69

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mahamat Alhadji
University of Garoua, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Dudjo Yen Boris
Université de Dchang, Cameroun

Reviewer 3: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo
Université des Mascareignes, Mauritius

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.

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: DUDJO Yen Boris	
University/Country: Université de Dchang, Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 Aout 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 Septembre 2024
Manuscript Title: <i>Les concessions minières des compagnies industrielles à l'épreuve de l'exploitation artisanale clandestine: le cas de la mine d'or de Hiré, Côte d'Ivoire</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0732/24	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> -Diagnostic des concessions minières des campagnes industrielles à l'épreuve de l'exploitation artisanale clandestine -Diagnostic de l'exploitation artisanale clandestine en Côte d'Ivoire: cas de la mine d'or de Hiré	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les outils d'analyse pour cas d'étude sont relativement basique	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Pas de revue de la littérature?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Pas d’outil d’analyse fiable comme Stata, SPSS, NVIVO.....	
Au niveau de l’enquête, c’est un peu ambigu : nous avons pu interroger trois-cent cinquante (350) orpailleurs en activité; Aussi, cinq cent quarante-quatre (544) autres opérateurs d’activités connexes; En outre, un questionnaire adressé à trente-huit (38) autres personnes hors site d’orpillage réparties sur neuf (9) couches socioprofessionnelles. On a l’impression au vu des figures que 38 personnes sont concernées par cette enquête.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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):

Nous suggérons l’intégration d’une revue de littérature, revoir les outils d’analyse. A la lecture de vos résultats, sauf erreur de ma part, on peut constater que l’étude porte sur 38 participants alors que l’introduction présente 932 participants.

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: Dr Nirmal Kumar Betchoo	
University/Country: Université des Mascareignes, Mauritius	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/09/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/09/2024
Manuscript Title: <i>Les concessions minières des compagnies industrielles à l'épreuve de l'exploitation artisanale clandestine: le cas de la mine d'or de Hiré, Côte d'Ivoire</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32.07.2024	
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: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

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>(Please insert your comments)</i> A long title in French but explains quite well the problem of mineral extraction in Cote d'Ivoire.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract relates the context of the research. It is based on secondary data. There is a citation and I guess whether this can be included or not here.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The text is well written and mastered in French language and the reviewer did not find errors .	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The sampling frame and the number of interviews are fairly large. This might be a time-consuming activity and the time frame must be briefly explained. How can data collection be consistent for a large sample size?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results are good as there is a combination of statistics—basic plus pictures to illustrate the case which are essential here as well as a framework to explain the role of the key variables analysed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They are good as they express the concerns at the ore in Cote d’Ivoire. They speak of improving conditions, legalizing mineral extract, sensitization of environment.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They are a few but could be increased here. Tere is a very good reference dating 1913 which is also symbolical of descriptive research. A few recent ones might be added,	

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):

Please add more references. Possibility of removing citation in abstract. May be for the future, some more elaborate data or statistical manipulation. Level of language is very good.