



**Paper: “Cultural Heritage and Local Development: Case of Dida (Southwestern of the Republic of Côte d’Ivoire) for Promoting Sustainable and Inclusive Development”**

**Submitted: 23 December 2025**

**Accepted: 28 February 2026**

**Published: 31 March 2026**

Corresponding Author: Gninin Aicha Toure

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n8p26

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fernando Paulo Oliveira Magalhaes  
Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal

Reviewer 2: Seyed Salam Fathi  
Catania University, Italy

Reviewer 3: Blinded

### 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!***

Reviewer Name: Fernando Magalhães	
University/Country: Polytechnic University of Leiria - Portugal	
Date Manuscript Received: 14-01-2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 02-02-2026
Manuscript Title: <b>CULTURAL HERITAGE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT: CASE OF DIDA (SOUTHWESTERN OF THE REPUBLIC OF COTE D'IVOIRE)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0116/26	
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.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title reflects the article's objectives. However, I think that the concept of local development should be explained more explicitly with the use of bibliographic sources.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>I propose that the first paragraph of the abstract be written as follows: The Dida community was established between the 15th and 18th centuries in the region corresponding to the present-day Côte d'Ivoire. This community constitutes an exceptional contributor to the enrichment of Ivorian cultural heritage. The keywords should be synthetic, as you can see in the document (text received) in red. Methods are well formulated the results as well. However, it is recommended to review the quotations as they are highlighted in red in the text.</i>	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The text is well written and contains no grammatical errors; however, I advise you to review the annotations highlighted in red in the attached text.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The methods are well explained but they do not correspond to the body of the text; the voices of the interviewees are not heard anywhere.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In the discussion, this phrase needs to be explained: Culture offers numerous advantages, both for individuals and for the communities in which they live (Explain why). (See the text)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>They are correct.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Correct. I think that concepts like local development should be explained more explicitly with the use of bibliographic sources.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I believe the voices of the interviewees are absent from the narrative text, and it is urgent to include them throughout the text, as this will be the text's greatest weakness. As for the rest, the corrections noted in the text are suggested.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### **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: <b>19/01/2026</b>	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>CULTURAL HERITAGE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT: CASE OF DIDA (SOUTHWESTERN OF THE REPUBLIC OF COTE D'IVOIRE)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0916-5392">https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0916-5392</a>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>NO</b>	
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: <b>Yes</b>	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title of the article, "Cultural Heritage and Local Development: Case of Dida (Southwestern of the Republic of Côte d'Ivoire)," is generally clear, descriptive, and consistent with the article. The two main concepts of "cultural heritage" and "local development" are well defined, and the geographical scope of the study is also correctly stated. Nevertheless, the title could be improved by adding a phrase such as "participating in sustainable and inclusive development" to better express the main objective of the article.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
The abstract clearly states the research objective and methodological approach. It provides a good overview of the study context and relevance. According to ESJ abstract guidelines, authors should include one concise sentence summarizing the main findings and conclusions, especially regarding the development outcomes identified.	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>The manuscript is generally well written and understandable. However, minor grammatical and stylistic issues are present, mainly in the Discussion section, where sentences are occasionally long and complex. A light academic language revision would enhance clarity and readability, but no major rewriting is required.</p> <p>Revised comment with concrete examples from the manuscript:  For example, in the Discussion section, the following sentence is relatively long and could be simplified for clarity:  <i>“Innovation and creativity in the traditional textile sector, for example, enable the Dida people to showcase cultural values that extend beyond the borders of Côte d’Ivoire.”</i>  This sentence could be shortened or split to improve readability.  Similarly, the sentence below contains multiple ideas in a single structure:  <i>“Also, a good policy for the promotion and management of cultural assets can have enormous economic benefits for societies.”</i>  Minor restructuring would make the argument clearer and more direct.  In the Methods section, the heading “Methodology Approach” contains a spelling error and should be corrected to “<b>Methodology Approach</b>”.  A light academic language revision would enhance clarity and readability, but no major rewriting is required.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<p>In the Methodology Approach section, the methodology is clearly described. However, the article does not clearly explain how the interview data were analyzed. One short sentence should be added specifying the qualitative analysis approach (e.g., thematic analysis).</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>Results are organized and thematically structured, providing a framework for understanding the findings through three categorizations (tangible heritage, intangible heritage, and natural heritage). A variety of field evidence, implicit quotations, and cultural examples further enhance the credibility of the results.</p> <p>However, the findings remain somewhat descriptive and could have been made clearer through the use of tables, charts, or brief analytical summaries at the end of each subsection.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>Conclusions accurately reflect the results and are aligned with research objectives. The emphasis on cultural heritage as a driver of local development is well supported.</p> <p>This section could be strengthened by adding one or two concrete recommendations for policy or cultural management practices.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<p>The reference list is relevant and demonstrates engagement with both international and local literature.</p> <p>However, minor revisions are needed to ensure full compliance with APA style, including formatting consistency and clarification of some web-based sources.</p>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**This manuscript addresses an important and underexplored topic and provides valuable insights into the role of cultural heritage in local development. This study is methodologically sound and well-grounded in both theory and fieldwork. With minor revisions to the language, abstract, and reference format, the article will be suitable for publication in the European Scientific Journal.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**