



**Paper: “Usages déviants de l’intelligence artificielle sur les réseaux sociaux numériques en Côte d’Ivoire”**

**Submitted: 09 April 2026**

**Accepted: 14 May 2026**

**Published: 31 May 2026**

Corresponding Author: Josselin Wilfred Azi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n14p100

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bouharati Saddek  
UFAS Setif1 University, Algeria

Reviewer 2: Hicham Balafrej  
Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Tangier, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Zemoura Djamel  
University of Mohamed Khider Biskra, Algeria

### 3ESJ 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: Pr. Bouharati Saddek	
University, Country: Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.04.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 26.04.2026
Manuscript Title: ANALYSIS OF DEVIANT USES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON DIGITAL SOCIAL NETWORKS IN COTE D'IVOIRE.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.04.2026	
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.

<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>	4/5
<i>The title is direct and precise enough to be clearly associated with the article's content. The title accurately specifies the nature of the study; identifies AI and deviant use of social networks as being the subject of the research for the population of Côte d'Ivoire; however, it could be shorter and more concise.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objective*s, methods, and results.</b>	4/5
<i>The abstract gives a description of objectives, methodology and results. The abstract adequately describes; objectives, methodology and key findings. It is adequately organized and contains sufficient information. A minor improvement to the abstract would be offering a clearer description of the methodology used for the study.</i>	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3/5</b>
<i>There are grammatical and spelling errors in the article. There are several instances of grammatical errors, repetition or minor formatting inconsistencies throughout the article (percentage usage, punctuation). The author may want to have the manuscript edited for language.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<i>The methodology is adequately explained in the study. The methodology of the study (data collection methods / sample) is adequately documented within the study. However more detail about how data was validated and limitations related to data collection would help to improve the section on the methodology.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3/5</b>
<i>The study results are presented clearly and free from errors. The study results are sufficiently communicated to the readers and are supported through the use of a table. However, there are a few repeated errors that should be corrected; formatting for percentages and values.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>The conclusion of this study is supported by the data collected and has shown that regulation has major implications for the results of the study. The study contains relevant and adequate references, but some formatting issues need to be corrected in order to align with acceptable academic style.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4/5</b>
<i>The references are relevant and sufficiently comprehensive. Some formatting inconsistencies should be corrected to meet academic standards.</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

For the Authors: The topic of the article is important, timely and a major issue that requires the manuscript to be improved with respect to language, consistency in presenting the results and research methodology. Proofreading will substantially improve the overall quality of the manuscript along with making minor modifications to the overall manuscript layout and format.

### 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: Dr. Hicham Balafrej	
University, Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University Tangier Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/04/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/05/2026
Manuscript Title: ANALYSE DES USAGES DEVIANTS DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE SUR LES RESEAUX SOCIAUX NUMERIQUES EN COTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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 aim of the paper</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The topic is particularly innovative in the West African context. The empirical study of Ivorian cyberspace, with 85% of internet users present on social networks, fully justifies the urgency of this research.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>An in-depth reading should be done by the authors</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>Contradiction in the data collection method: The abstract states that the data was collected using "targeted scraping." However, in the methodology section, the authors explain that they've published an "advertisement aimed at tagging us in all posts" involving AI. Asking internet users to tag them falls under the category of participatory observation or crowdsourcing, and absolutely not web scraping (which is automated extraction via algorithms). This contradiction undermines the credibility of the author's approach. Sampling bias: By relying on reports from the author's community (the internet users who tag them), the sample is not representative. they depend on the perception (and biases) of these internet users to define what constitutes AI-related misconduct</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Lack of a "Discussion" section: Currently, the authors go directly from the presentation of the results (Table 1) to a few very short subsections on the underlying logic and structuring effects. A proper discussion section should compare the results with the literature cited in the introduction to show how the study confirms, refutes, or expands upon existing knowledge.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Authors should rewrite the conclusion adding a summary of the methodology used as well as the results obtained, clarifying the path for future studies based on the paper's results</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

1. Clarify the Methodology: Remove the mention of "scraping" if you did not use automated computer scripts (e.g., Python/BeautifulSoup/Google Chrome web scraping add-in). Honestly describe your crowdsourcing method and acknowledge its limitations.
  2. Enhance the Analysis: Quantitative results (descriptive statistics) are limited for a sample of 204. Add qualitative (anonymized) excerpts from these posts to illustrate how AI was used (e.g., image generators, ChatGPT, etc.).
  3. Restructure the article: Introduction (including the research question)
    - o Literature review and theoretical framework (to be consolidated)
    - o Methodology (to be revised and expanded)
    - o Results (Tables and qualitative transcripts)
    - o Discussion (Theoretical comparison and implications)
    - o Conclusion (Limitations and avenues for future research)
- Your manuscript contains rich and highly relevant raw material. Once the methodology is clarified and the analysis is thorough, based on a solid conceptual framework, this article will draw the path for the scientific community in this field.

Good luck!!!!

# ***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:	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/05/2026
Manuscript Title : ANALYSE DES USAGES DEVIANTS DE L'INTELLIGENCE ARTIFICIELLE SUR LES RESEAUX SOCIAUX NUMERIQUES EN COTE D'IVOIRE.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
The title effectively summarizes the central thesis: that AI is being leveraged for deviant and criminal purposes within the specific context of the Ivorian digital ecosystem	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<p>Based on the sources, here are specific examples of these issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Typographical Errors:</b> Table 1 contains a double percentage sign for the first entry ("37,74%%") and is missing the percentage sign entirely for the third entry ("17,64").</li> <li>• <b>Spacing and Formatting Issues:</b> There is a missing space in the reference to the law: "loi n° 2013-451stipule".</li> <li>• <b>Grammar and Agreement Errors:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In the abstract, "logiques d'atteintes individuelle" contains an agreement error; the adjective should be plural ("individuelles") to match "atteintes".</li> <li>○ The text uses the masculine pronoun "ceux" when referring to "publications" (a feminine noun in French): "retenir que ceux impliquant l'usage de l'IA". It should be "celles".</li> <li>○ The conclusion contains the phrase "poser les base", which is missing the plural "s" on "bases".</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Missing Prepositions and Spelling:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The phrase "renforcer les connaissances éthiques autour ces outils" is missing a preposition and should read "autour de ces outils".</li> <li>○ The word "champs" is incorrectly used in the singular context of "son champs d'action"; it should be "champ."</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Sentence Structure:</b> The text frequently uses sentence fragments that lack a main verb, such as the list of results provided in the abstract and the results section: "Les fausses informations (77 soit, 37,74%), les manipulations politiques (59 soit, 28,92%)...".</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the filename provided in the notebook ("61.04.2026.docx") appears to contain a date error, as there is no 61st day in April, though this is external to the text itself. Overall, while the research objectives and findings are clear, the formal presentation lacks rigorous proofreading.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p>Here is the detailed analysis based on the sources:</p> <p><b>Clarity of presentation:</b> The results are presented in an organized manner in a dedicated section. Table 1 allows for a quick visualization of the distribution of the 204 identified deviant uses.</p> <p>The categorization (false information, political manipulation, etc.) is clear, and each category is then detailed in relation to Ivorian legislation.</p> <p><b>Typographical errors in the table:</b> Table 1, which is the central element of the results, contains data entry errors:</p>	

<p>The frequency for "False information" is noted as "37.74%" with a double percent sign.</p> <p>The frequency for "Damage to honor and image" is noted as "17.64," completely omitting the percent sign.</p> <p>Calculation and writing inconsistencies:</p> <p>Rounding issue: In the analysis of usage patterns, the percentages cited are 66.66% for collective manipulation and 33.32% for individual impact. Adding these two values gives a total of 99.98%, which reveals a slight calculation or rounding error compared to the expected total of 100%.</p> <p>Textual error: The results analysis contains a spelling mistake in the very first sentence after the table: "prè de la moitié" instead of "près".</p> <p>In conclusion, while the structure and logic of the results are clear, the presence of factual and calculation errors prevents us from fully validating your assertion.</p>	
<p><b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>
<p>The conclusions and summary provided in the article are accurate and strongly supported by the empirical data and analysis presented in the preceding sections.</p>	
<p><b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>
<p>The justification for this rating, based on the sources, is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Multidisciplinary Scope:</b> The references are comprehensive because they span several critical domains affected by AI, including education (Arar et al., 2025; Avo, 2023), healthcare (Bhargava et al., 2024; Gruson, 2019), economics (Hebiosso &amp; Houkou, 2025), and security/cybercrime (Saber, 2023; Yebouet, 2015).</li> <li>• <b>Appropriate Legal Context:</b> The article includes a dedicated "Législation" section that cites specific Ivorian laws essential to the study's focus on cybercrime, such as Law n° 2013-451 and Law n° 2023-593.</li> <li>• <b>Currency of Sources:</b> The bibliography is very up-to-date, with many citations from 2024 and 2025, ensuring the research is grounded in the latest technological and academic developments.</li> <li>• <b>Integration of Local and International Data:</b> The authors appropriately cite local institutional reports (ANSSI, 2024; ARTCI, 2024; RGPH, 2021) alongside international digital trends (DataReportal, 2025) to provide a well-rounded context for the study in Côte d'Ivoire.</li> <li>• <b>Minor Omission:</b> While the list is mostly complete, there is a technical error: Kouakou (2024) is cited in the body of the text regarding the impact of AI on economic growth, but this source is missing from the final reference list.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the references provide a solid academic and legal foundation for the study's claims, despite the single missing entry.</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):**

#### Required Minor Revisions:

1. Correct the Results Table (Table 1): The central data table contains typographical errors that must be fixed for accuracy. Specifically, "37,74%%" has a double percentage sign, and "17,64" is missing the percentage sign entirely.
2. Thorough Proofreading: The text contains multiple grammatical and spelling errors in both French and English. Examples include agreement errors like "atteintes individuelle" (should be plural) and "poser les base" (missing 's'), as well as typos like "près de la moitié".
3. Address Calculation Inconsistency: The calculation for "logics of use" (66.66% + 33.32%) totals 99.98%. The authors should check their rounding or calculations to ensure a total of 100%.
4. Complete the Reference List: The source Kouakou (2024) is cited in the text regarding AI's impact on the economy but is missing from the final bibliography.
5. Clarify Dates: The filename ("61.04.2026.docx") and some text citations (Arar et al., 2025; Hebioso & Hounkou, 2025) suggest the paper is written from a future perspective (2026). The authors should ensure all dates are consistent with the intended publication timeline.

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