

**Paper: “Diagnostic de l’application du droit international humanitaire durant la crise burundaise de « 1994-2004 »”**

**Submitted: 13 April 2022**

**Accepted: 17 June 2022**

**Published: 30 June 2022**

Corresponding Author: Nzohabonayo Anaclet

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p207](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p207)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Habib Kazzi  
Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Achille Magloire Ngah  
Université de Yaoundé II, Cameroun

# 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: Kazzi	
University/Country: Lebanese University	
Date Manuscript Received: 3/5/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/5/2022
Manuscript Title: Du droit international humanitaire et de son applicabilité au Burundi durant la crise de 1994-2004	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0456/22	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is in adequacy with the content and scope of the contribution.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract is well-structured around the issue and the method adopted by the author. However, the latter should underline clearer the major results of his analysis.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are no major grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. The author should, however, ensure the appropriate space between the paragraphs for more clarity.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>To deal with these various articulations of the theme, the study uses documentary and analytical research methods.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results show clearly that, despite the Humanitarian international Law's fundamental requirements, the parties to the conflict have cynically committed violations in defiance of the principle of discrimination, of respect for non-military objectives, of the protection of children and women to whom HIL nevertheless confers special protection during the conflict. armed.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Conclusions and summary are accurate and reflect the content of the contribution.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>References are diverse and relevant.</i>	

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

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

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

The author is required to redraft the abstract to highlight his main results and recommendations.

The author should also adopt the appropriate space between the paragraphs for more clarity.

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

# 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 Achille Magloire NGAH	
University/Country: Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/05/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/05/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Du droit international humanitaire et de son applicabilité au Burundi durant la crise de 1994-2004</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0456/22	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>Le concept "application" est plus indiqué qu'"appliquabilité" car le conflit ayant déjà pris fin et dans ce sens il serait plus indiqué de parler d'un "diagnostic de l'application du DIH durant la crise burundaise de 1994-2004"</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>Faire lire le texte par un littéraire, beaucoup de coquilles</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Absence remarquable d'une méthode juridique, on se serait attendu à ce que les auteurs se servent de la dogmatique juridique ou de la casuistique</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>La problématique est problématique. Suggestion: "les règles du DIH ont elle été valablement appliquée dans la crise burundaise?"</i></li> <li>• <i>Le plan n'est pas juridique. Suggestion d'un plan à deux parties:</i></li> </ul> <i>I. Une application mitigée dans la qualification de la crise;</i> <i>I. II- Une application justifiée dans la sanction des violations avérée</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):** revoir le titre, la problématique, trouver la méthode juridique qui cadre avec

**l'étude et faire un effort pour élaborer un plan en deux parties.  
Se faire relire par un littéraire.**

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