



Paper: “Recherches archéologiques dans les localités d’Ahouaty, N’dénou et Singrobo (centre de la Côte d’Ivoire) : contexte, bilan et perspectives”

Submitted: 03 May 2025

Accepted: 25 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Bouadi Kouadio René

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n17p185

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zahra Mourabit
Cadi Ayyad University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Fonyama Elise Thiombiano-Ilboudo
Ministre de la Culture, des Arts et du Tourisme, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and in accordance with the text. It is about ensuring preventive archaeology in the implementation of large-scale projects. The results uncovered remains from all periods. The assessment allows for the preservation of remains from the Paleolithic and Neolithic eras. A site will also be preserved thanks to this study. The context, the assessment, and the prospects are clearly addressed in the text.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract present clearly Objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are some grammatical errors and typos in this article, the comments of which are in the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the study methods are explained clearly

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

See the observations in the text evaluation. but the summary is correct

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is good

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

the list of reference is good

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the text for corrections

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and adequate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes — The abstract clearly states the objects, detailed method and results as well. However, a gentle improvement on the section of results could be addressed (see manuscript comments).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods are clearly explained and provide a detailed and coherent description, which includes the use of diagnostic studies, individual and group interviews, awareness campaigns, pedestrian surveys, soundings, and sampling.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, The CONCLUSION is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, the list of references is generally comprehensive and appropriate. However, some references listed are not cited within the main text, and certain sections, such as the introduction, could benefit from bibliographic support. See the comment on the manuscript.

*Please rate the **TITLE** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **ABSTRACT** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
