



**Manuscript: “Résilience Communautaire Des Riverains Autochtones Batwa Dans Le Contexte Du Conflit Au Parc National De Kahuzi Biega, Est De La Rd. Congo”**

**Submitted: 01 September 2020**

**Accepted: 06 October 2020**

**Published: 31 October 2020**

Corresponding Author: Pacifique Mukumba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p83

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Kouame Jacques

Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 2:** Gnamien Konan Bah

Université Jean Lorougnon Guede – Daloa Cote d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 3:** Jean Arnaud N’drin

Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Cocody, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 4:** Folefack Denis Pompidou

Centre Africain de Recherches sur Bananiers Plantains, Cameroon

# ***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: KOUAME JACQUES	Email:
University/Country: Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/09/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Community Resilience Of Batwa Indigenous Peoples In The Context Of Conflict At Kahuzi Biega National Park, East Of Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is clear and matches the content of the article. It sums up the content of the article well.	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article : the author must reread the text to correct errors: omission of articles, etc.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The study methods are clearly explained.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The body of the paper is clear and contain few error. Numerical determinants must be written in letters before numbers. For example “23 initiatives... I propose: “twenty three (23) initiatives...”</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The conclusions and summary are correct and corroborate the content. but, they must be improved.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

The author must reread the text in order to correct certain expression errors, to reformulate certain sentences. This work brings us added value on the resilience strategies of communities in shock situation.

**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: GNAMIEN KONAN BAH MODESTE	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE JEAN LOROUGNON GUEDE – DALOA COTE D’IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Résilience Communautaire Des Riverains Autochtones Batwa Dans Le Contexte Du Conflit Au Parc National De Kahuzi Biega, Est De La Rd. Congo	
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 published version 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>3</b>
<b>Le titre est clair et adéquat au contenu de l'article.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>

La méthodologie n'est pas suffisamment décrite. Il manque la nature de l'étude (Qualitative ou quantitative), le mode d'échantillonnage et la méthode d'analyse. Le résumé peut être rédigé en un seul Bloc. La conclusion n'est pas nécessaire dans le résumé.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
La méthodologie présente beaucoup d'insuffisances et doit être profondément améliorée, la nature de l'étude (Qualitative ou quantitative) doit être décrite ainsi que la discipline scientifique dans laquelle elle s'insère, le mode d'échantillonnage doit être également décrit et justifié. La méthode d'analyse doit être clairement nommée, expliquée et justifiée.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Le cadre méthodologique mérite profondément d'être amélioré. Le référentiel qui a permis de catégoriser les principales initiatives de résilience des riverains doit être préciser et expliqué.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
La conclusion et le résumé reprennent fidèlement le contenu.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
Les références sont comprehensive et appropriées	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

J'encourage les auteurs à prendre en compte toutes les observations pour améliorer davantage le document.

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

Merci pour la confiance renouvelée.

# ***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: Jean Arnaud N'drin	Email:
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/10/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Résilience Communautaire Des Riverains Autochtones Batwa Dans Le Contexte Du Conflit Au Parc National De Kahuzi Biega, Est De La Rd. Congo</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 66/09/2020	
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>3</b>

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Pas besoin de différencier les parties par des titres dans le résumé ( introduction, méthodologie, résultats et conclusion)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Le document souffre moins de fautes, mais n'empêche qu'il peut être relu pour plus de perfection.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les méthodes sont bien exprimées.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Très moins d'erreurs, bon dans l'ensemble.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il y a une bonne relation entre la conclusion, le résumé et le contenu.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
Les références bibliographiques correspondent au contenu et sont récentes.	

**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):**

Revoir légèrement le document en enlevant les différents titres utilisés dans les différentes parties.

Cela se trouve dans le résumé, l'introduction et la conclusion.

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