

Manuscript: “**Solidarité Associative Et Résilience Traumatique :
Le Cas De l’Association Sénégalaise Des Victimes De Mines (ASVM)**”

Submitted: 17 February 2021

Accepted: 06 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Ismaïla Sene

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n15p142

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: ADOU Bini Yao Christophe, CNRA, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Dr Ibrahim Ousseini Issa, Tahoua, Niger

Reviewer 3: Rachid Ismaili, Ministère de la santé, Maroc

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: ADOU Bini Yao Christophe	
University/Country: CNRA/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Solidarité associative et résilience traumatique : le cas de l'Association Sénégalaise des Victimes de Mines (ASVM)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.03.2021	
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.	5
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>Résumé incomplet. C'est seulement le contexte qui y figure. Il manque « matériel-méthode-résultats » et « conclusion ».</i> <i>Voici la composition d'un résumé : « contexte (1/4 du volume du résumé) » ; «</i>	

<i>matériel-méthode-résultats (1/2 du volume du résumé) » et « conclusion (~1/4 du volume du résumé) ».</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Très bonne rhétorique.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Une introduction sans citation bibliographique.</i> • <i>L'expression « ¹ Parmi elles, il y'a 554 civils dont 418 blessés et 136 tués. » est confuse serait et inutile. En effet, dans le texte on parle de « 554 blessées et 197 tuées par les mines ». Revoyez le dénombrement.</i> • <i>En cas de citations multiples, l'ordre d'ancienneté n'a pas été respecté.</i> • 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Le style de rapport de réunion est beaucoup inséré dans la discussion.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Une conclusion doit être rédigée en un seul paragraphe.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Dans les textes, les références ont citées comme si l'on est dans la partie références bibliographique. Exemple : « Comme l'a démontré P. Boquel (2009) » (page 5).</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

C'est un très bon article, intéressant à lire. Il n'a plus d'effort à fournir si ce n'est que le résumé seul qu'il faut reprendre. C'est à cause du résumé seul que je propose ce renvoi. Ceci, dans le souci de rendre encore plus intéressant cet article et confirmer ainsi ces qualifications que j'y apporte. C'est dans votre intérêt.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dr Ibrahim Ousseini Issa	
University/Country: Tahoua/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 mars 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 mars 2021
Manuscript Title: Solidarité associative et résilience traumatique : le cas de l'Association Sénégalaise des Victimes de Mines (ASVM)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0305/21	
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 article.	5
<i>(Le titre de l'article est non seulement clair mais aussi adapté au contenu de l'article. Il faut reconnaître que dans son analyse, l'auteur a fourni un effort scientifique digne de ce nom.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Dans le résumé, il faut faire ressortir en quelques lignes la méthodologie de recherche et les résultats de l'étude.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Un article bien rédigé tout respectant les règles grammaticales et orthographiques.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Les méthodes d'étude clairement expliquées. Il faut juste tenir compte de quelques observations qui ont été faites.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Là aussi, il faut juste prendre en compte les quelques observations déjà faites pour améliorer ton document.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Une littérature bien élaborée et soutenue à travers des recherches empiriques et documentaires.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Les normes bibliographiques bien respectées tout au long de la liste des documents consultés par l'auteur.)</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):

Un article bien rédigé dans un style scientifique correct et compréhensif. Cependant, il faut tenir compte des observations et remarques qui ont été faites tout au long du texte dans le but de l'enrichir ou de l'améliorer.

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: Rachid ISMAILI	
University/Country: Ministère de la santé / Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Solidarité associative et résilience traumatique : le cas de l'Association Sénégalaise des Victimes de Mines (ASVM)	
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.	4
Pas de commentaires	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Développez d'avantage le résumé	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Il faut développer la méthodologie d'étude	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Développer les perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Développez et ajouter des références plus récentes</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):

NO