



Paper: “Analyse discursive du fonctionnement de l’espace dans L’enfant noir de Camara Laye et Les Soleils des indépendances d’Ahmadou Kourouma”

Submitted: 15 June 2025

Accepted: 29 July 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Delali Kofi Tortor

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n23p96

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bouyahya Adil

CRMEF (Centre régional des métiers de l’enseignement et de la formation) Fès, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Kalidou SY

Université Gaston Berger de St-Louis, Sénégal

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Kalidou SY	
University/Country: Université Gaston Berger de St-Louis (Sénégal)	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/07/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analyse discursive du fonctionnement de l'espace dans L'enfant noir de Camara Laye et Les Soleils des indépendances d'Ahmadou Kourouma	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: OUI	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments)	3
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments)	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. (Please insert your comments)	3
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. (Please insert your comments)	3

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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	OUI
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les objectifs de recherche sont pertinents et il y a un effort pour analyser le corpus et convoquer les références. Cependant l'article gagnerait à redéfinir le concept de toposémie et à le distinguer si nécessaire de celui de toponymie (la toposémie est d'ailleurs très peu utilisée dans le texte). L'argumentation est souvent trop générale et manipule des concepts peu clairs. Il faut être plus synthétique et analyser les passages cités du point de vue discursif pour mieux cadrer avec le titre de l'article. Il faut utiliser judicieusement les références à Maingueneau et Jean Michel Adam par rapport à la linguistique pour le texte littéraire. Les travaux de Denis Bertrand et éventuellement de Claude Zilberberg et de Jacques Geninasca pourront vous être utiles pour un Meilleur cadrage du rapport entre espace physique et espace symbolique d'une part et d'autre part des mécanismes de figuration et de configuration.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: BOUYAHYA Adil	
University/Country: CRMEF (Centre régional des métiers de l'enseignement et de la formation) Fès, MAROC	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/06/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/06/2025
Manuscript Title: Analyse discursive du fonctionnement de l'espace dans L'enfant noir de Camara Laye et Les Soleils des indépendances d'Ahmadou Kourouma	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0702/25	
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: 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.	3
le titre reprend clairement la teneur de l'article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
Le résumé est fidèle aux objectifs, à la méthodologie et aux résultats.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
Revoir les erreurs de langue, de construction.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Les concepts méthodologiques sont respectés en toute clarté.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les débouchées de l'article sont articulées clairement.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La conclusion se réfère aux résultats. Toutefois on pourrait se projeter sur d'autres horizons.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les références doivent être actualisées.</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):

J'ai relu attentivement l'article. J'ai noté **quelques erreurs de langue** (orthographe, grammaire, syntaxe) qui, une fois corrigées, permettront d'améliorer la qualité globale et la compréhension du texte.
