



Paper: “Différenciation Identitaire, Usage et Fonction des Édifices Religieux dans la Gouvernance Urbaine à Meiganga (Nord-Cameroun)”

Corresponding Author: Catherine Laure Lissouck

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n20p30

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gbaguidi Arnauld
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Maximenne Amontcha
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

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:	Email:
University/Country	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 nd May 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 31 st May 2020
Manuscript Title: Religious edifices, urban functionality and governance in Meiganga, North Cameroon.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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
The title is well structured and it is very clear.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

The abstract is clear and well explained.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Some sentences have minor grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
It is a mixed methodology, correct approach to the topic	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
There are no errors and the body paper is clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Conclusions are written in a concise and appropriate language for the topic.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
I expected more references. The ones presented are comprehensive and appropriate.	

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):

The work is well explained with minor revision to be done.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None



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: GBAGUIDI Arnaud	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 mai 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 mai 2020
Manuscript Title: Edifices religieux, fonctionnalité et gouvernance urbaine à Meiganga dans le Nord-Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0628/20	
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.	4
<i>Oui le titre est approprié et est en adéquation avec le contenu du texte</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>Oui le résumé est assez clair cependant il pourrait être amélioré en insérant l'objet et en donnant un peu de détails sur la démarche méthodologique</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Efforts très louables en matière de rédaction. Le texte est sans faute et le style est digeste</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>la méthodologie utilisée est bonne mais gagnerait à être détaillée. Elle est trop succincte</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>La lecture et la compréhension sont aisées et il y a une bonne logique et une cohérence dans le développement</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est convenable et est en adéquation avec le contenu présenté</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références sont acceptables mais peuvent être améliorées</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):

L'article est pertinent et pose la problématique des enjeux socioéconomiques de l'abandon de l'espace urbain par l'Etat et sa prise en main par les confessions religieuses qui, à travers l'érection d'infrastructures religieuses et sociales favorisent une certaine cohésion sociale et fonctionnelle malgré la bipolarisation religieuse, suppléant ainsi à l'absence de l'Etat. Cependant il manque de précisions sur l'objet de la recherche dans le résumé. Par ailleurs, il serait bon de donner plus de détails sur la démarche méthodologique (Taille, techniques et outils de collecte. Il faudrait également préciser clairement les résultats obtenus. Enfin, dans la discussion, il aurait été bien de développer

des concepts comme la ségrégation urbaine ou la fragmentation urbaine afin de voir en quels termes se pose la réalité ici décrite avant de le mettre en rapport avec la gouvernance urbaine.

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!***

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: /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.	1
<i>(Revoir le titre à la lumière des propositions faites sur le texte) Proposition: Différenciation identitaire, usage et fonction des edifices religieux dans la gouvernance urbaine à Meiganga (Nord-Cameroun)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>(voir observations relatives à la demarches et l'eventualité d'un cadre theorique</i>	

<i>pour l'analyse des données sur le texte dans la revision du résumé)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(texte bien ecrit mais trop de longues phrases qui rendent la lecture difficile)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(le texte est trop descriptive et la construction de l'objet d'etude pas encore affinée)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Revoir à la lumière du cadre theorique en rapport avec les questions de dynamique appropriation de l'espace, de dynamique ou de transformation des l'espace urbain)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<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	x
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): sujet interessant toutefois revoir la construction de l'objet, la demarche de travail et l'analyse à la lumière des observations produites sur le papier

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: