



Paper: “Processus d’intégration des migrants Mbororo à l’économie urbaine : cas de Bafoussam et Dschang (Ouest-Cameroun)”

Corresponding Author: Linda Pamela Kamgne Kamwa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n17p155

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ibrahim Djibo Moussa
Université Dan Dicko Dankoulodo de Maradi, Niger

Reviewer 2: Raoul Étongué Mayer
Laurentian University, Canada

Published: 30.06.2020

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: Djibo Moussa Ibrahim	
University/Country: Université Dan Dicko Dankoulodo de Maradi / Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Insertion socio-économique des Mbororo dans les villes de Bafoussam et Dschang (Ouest Caméroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0617/20	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Je trouve le titre clair.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé nécessite une révision globale. Il est très mal structuré. Ni objectifs d'étude, une méthodologie sans précision et des résultats mal présentés.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il n'y a pas assez d'erreurs grammaticale et orthographique, mais trop de pléonasme.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Cette partie est absolument à reprendre dans sa forme comme dans son fond. Elle ne donne aucune précision convaincante.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Elle a massacré la rigueur scientifique (Voir nos commentaires).	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Lorsque l'introduction, la méthodologie, les résultats et la discussion sont mal présentés, le résumé et la conclusion en souffrent aussi.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Très peu de références et d'ailleurs leur présentation n'est pas conforme aux normes de rédaction scientifique.	

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):

J'ose espérer que les Co-auteurs prêtent main forte à la Doctorante pour prendre en compte la rigueur scientifique dans sa production. Nos commentaires et suggestion ne visent qu'à améliorer la qualité du document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Pas de suggestion



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: Raoul Étongué Mayer	Email:
University/Country: Laurentian University, Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: May 20, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 27, 2020
Manuscript Title: Insertion socio-économique des Mbororo dans les villes de Bafoussam et Dschang (Ouest Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes I do	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes I do	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes I do	

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.	2
<i>Le titre retenu ne rend pas compte de la réalité des faits sur le terrain. Vraisemblablement, le problème à traiter est celui de la migration (exode rural), de la sédentarisation et de l'intégration des Bororos à l'économie urbaine : cas de Bafoussam et Dschang.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Résumé mal rédigé.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Le texte est mal écrit. Il manque de rigueur scientifique. Les fautes corrigées apparaissent en rouge dans le texte. L'utilisation boiteuse des concepts de niveau licence témoigne de profondes lacunes inacceptables au niveau doctoral.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>L'auteur principal ne maîtrise aucune des méthodes évoquées dans le texte. Les explications sur les méthodes qualitative et quantitative manquent de clarté.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
<i>Texte confus. Les concepts méthode, méthodologie ne sont pas clairs. Les auteurs parlent d'immigrants là où il faut parler de migrants. Cette confusion soulève des doutes dans l'esprit de tout géographe bien formé et qui comprend ce qu'est l'exode rural. Cf notes marginales.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
Conclusion mal écrite.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Acceptable</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Voir les remarques marginales.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Quand deux professeurs acceptent que leurs noms apparaissent sur un article, ils doivent s'assurer de son contenu et de sa qualité scientifique. Accompagnent-ils véritablement cette étudiante ?