



Paper: “Déscolarisation féminine et insertion socio-professionnelle en Côte d’Ivoire : analyse des limites de l’apprentissage en milieu urbain abidjanais”

Submitted: 15 January 2026

Accepted: 07 February 2026

Published: 28 February 2026

Corresponding Author: Safié Roseline epse N’Da

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n5p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Georges Kpazai
Laurentian University, Canada

Reviewer 2: Adjagbessi Joachim
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Mohammed Abid
Centre Régional des Métiers de l’Education et de la Formation, Kénitra, Maroc

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 1/20/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 1/25/2026
Manuscript Title: DESCOLARISATION, PRECARITE ET RISQUES SOCIAUX : LA REINSERTION DES JEUNES FILLES PAR L'APPRENTISSAGE EN COTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0168/26	
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:	
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
<i>The title is clear, concise and consistent with the content of the article. It explicitly states the central concepts (school dropout, precariousness, social risks, reintegration, learning) and the geographical context. The content of the article fully corresponds to this framework, both theoretically and empirically.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>Although somewhat lengthy, the abstract clearly presents the study's objective, which is to assess the actual effect of learning on the empowerment of beneficiaries. It explicitly sets out the methodology adopted, based on a qualitative approach using interviews, focus groups and reasoned sampling. It also highlights the main findings, in particular the persistence of precarious situations despite the acquisition of professional skills, and concludes with a coherent overall summary. The whole is structured, informative and in line with current scientific standards.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Overall, the article is well written from a linguistic point of view. However, there are a few minor errors in typography, punctuation and terminology consistency, although these do not detract from the overall understanding. A linguistic review would improve the formal quality.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<p><i>The methodology is described in detail and rigorously:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>justification of the qualitative choice,</i> - <i>description of the field (Abobo and Yopougon),</i> - <i>population studied (150 actors),</i> - <i>reasoned sampling,</i> - <i>collection tools (semi-structured interviews, focus groups),</i> - <i>principle of empirical saturation,</i> <p><i>This clarity guarantees the scientific credibility of the study.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clearly structured around three coherent analytical axes, which facilitates understanding of the logic behind the analysis. The selected verbatim quotes effectively illustrate the proposed interpretations and reinforce the empirical basis of the results. The interim conclusions are also logically linked to the data collected. However, readability could be further improved by adding a summary table showing the frequency of comments made by the various participants in the sample,</i>	

<i>which would highlight the recurrence of the themes addressed and reinforce the analytical rigour of the study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is solid, coherent and perfectly supported by the results. It summarises the main empirical findings and puts them into perspective with the theoretical frameworks used . It also opens up implications for public policy, which reinforces the scientific and social significance of the article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Enhance the list of references by including publications to reinforce the timeliness, relevance, and scientific credibility of the work. your comments)</i>	

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):

It would be appropriate to incorporate socio-economic data from official institutional sources to strengthen the contextual validity of the study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

<i>idée développée.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>Le résumé n'indique pas clairement le cadre théorique dans lequel l'étude s'inscrit, de même que la stratégie d'analyse des données.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>L'article est très bien écrit sur le plan grammatical et orthographique</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Plusieurs éléments d'ordre méthodologique sont absents dans l'écriture du cadre méthodologique. Ce qui affaiblit la robustesse de l'article et le caractère de reproductibilité de l'étude par une tierce personne. (Voir mes annotations dans le texte).</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<p><i>Il y a ici plusieurs insuffisances. Ne pas confondre le contenu de l'étape de la présentation des résultats et celle de la discussion des résultats. La question principale et les sous-questions de la recherche ne sont pas clairement indiquées. Le lecteur ne sait donc pas les raisons des axes de discussion des résultats.</i></p> <p><i>Par ailleurs, les références convoquées lors de la phase de discussion sont très vieilles. Pour un manuscrit de 2026, on devrait s'attendre à convoquer des travaux pas vieux d'une dizaine d'années. Car le but ultime d'une recherche est de faire avancer la connaissance. Il est donc impératif de se baser sur l'état actuel de la recherche.</i></p> <p><i>Voir les annotations dans le manuscrit</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>Bien que la conclusion supporte relativement le contenu de la recherche, elle ne prend pas la forme d'une investigation scientifique : 1) reprendre le but et les méthodes de la recherche. 2) indiquer les principaux résultats ou les apports de la recherche à l'état de la connaissance, 3) présenter les limites de la recherche et 4) émettre des pistes de recherches futures.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Oui, les références sont appropriées mais la quasi-totalité d'entre elles sont vieilles.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le thème de la recherche est pertinent et utile sur le plan social. Assurez vous que vous traitez de l'insertion socio-professionnelle et non de la réinsertion puisque les filles n'avaient jamais été dans le monde du travail. Insérer un cadre de référence (théorique ou conceptuel) bien identifié. Améliorer le contenu du cadre méthodologique. Actualiser vos références bibliographiques.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: