

Paper: “Distribution de cash-flows aux actionnaires : moyens, déterminants, effets et modèles”

Submitted: 18 September 2020

Accepted: 17 November 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Ahmed Nabaoui

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p230

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohamed Kora Gounou
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Alexis Ndarushimana
Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Burundi

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.

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: Mohamed KORA GOUNOU	Email:
---------------------------------------	--------

University/Country: Université de Parakou/ Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Distribution de liquidité aux actionnaires : moyens, déterminants, effets et modèles	
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.

<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.	3
<i>Le titre ne correspond pas au contenu de l'article. Vous avez développé la distribution des cash-flows et non des liquidités.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>Bien</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Les phrases sont longues ce qui ne permet pas de bien suivre les auteurs. La structuration des phrases est à reprendre</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Le papier se veut théorique mais ne fait pas une bonne synthèse théorique de la question du dividende. Il faut adopter une bonne méthode de lecture et synthèse des travaux.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain	4

errors.	
<i>Le texte contient peu d'erreurs</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>La conclusion annonce des développements qui n'ont pas été faits dans le texte.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>La plupart des références sont mal faites il faut les revoir</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'article respecte quelques règles de recherche scientifique. Toutefois sa structuration doit être revue en présentant d'une façon claire et bien expliquée les résultats de l'étude menée. Adopter des sous titres fédérateurs, des phrases simples par idée. Les références sont vieilles il faut les actualisées. Appuyer vos déclarations des sources. Les auteurs sont invités à revoir quelques fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.

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: Prof. Alexis Ndabarushimana	
University/Country: Ecole Nationale d'Administration, Burundi	
Date Manuscript Received:..... Nov 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 th November 2020
Manuscript Title: Distribution of liquidity to shareholders: means, determinants, effects and models	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13355-Article Text-39947-1-4-20200918	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	

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	2

article.	
<i>The case study should be mentioned</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The author must rewrite the abstract and respect the consigns mentioned in the body of the manuscript</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>The author must check again the manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The methods are not there.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>He/she mentioned some references without used them in the body of the manuscript. Check that aspect again</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>See the manuscript</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>See the manuscript</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) ~~Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.~~
- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: