

**Paper: “Lutte Contre l’Insalubrité au sein des Communautés Locales de la Mairie de Bujumbura : Analyse du Rôle de la Coopérative “Isuku Iwacu” de la Zone Kinama”**

**Submitted: 06 March 2020**

**Accepted: 23 November 2020**

**Published: 30 November 2020**

Corresponding Author: Alexis Ndabarushimana

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n32p78](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n32p78)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yabi Hervé  
University Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Aicha El Alaoui  
Sultan Moulay Slimane University, Morocco

# ***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: 16 oct 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 Oct 2020
Manuscript Title: <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lutte Contre l’Insalubrité au sein des Communautés Locales de la Mairie de Bujumbura : Analyse du Rôle de la Coopérative “IsukuIwacu” de la Zone Kinama</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>“Fight Against Unsanitary Conditions in the Local Communities of Bujumbura Mayorship: Analysis of the Role of the Cooperative “IsukuIwacu” in Kinama Area”</b></p>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0369/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <del>No</del>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <del>No</del>	

## **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</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The author must rewrite the abstract and respect the consigns mentioned in the body of the manuscript</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The author must check again the manuscript</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The author must add some theoretical framework. He/she mentioned some references without used them in the body of the manuscript.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>See the manuscript</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>See the manuscript</i>	

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

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

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

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) **Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.**

(2) ~~Changes which must be made before publication~~

**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: YABI Hervé	
University: Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: -
Manuscript Title : <b>Lutte Contre l'Insalubrité au sein des Communautés Locales de la Mairie de Bujumbura : Analyse du Rôle de la Coopérative "Isukulwacu" de la Zone Kinama</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.03.2020	
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 published version of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b><i>Le titre est adapté au contenu</i></b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Le résumé médiocre. La problématique y est mal faite. La méthodologie manque de précision. Les résultats sont assez partiels et ne rend pas compte du compte de l'article</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Un effort d'amélioration significative est attendu</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>La démarche méthodologique est moins claire. Les auteurs utilisés ne sont référencés. Les outils de SPSS utilisés ne sont pas précisés.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Le développement est à revoir, dans le fond comme dans la forme. Il est mal structuré. Les sections sont mal organisées et non numérotées.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Les éléments essentiels (problématique, rappel des grands résultats (avec des chiffres) et perspectives) manquent.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Les références bibliographiques sont mal faites et ne respectent à aucune norme. Elles sont remplies des auteurs qui ne sont mêmes pas cités dans le développement. Dans le même moment, les auteurs cités dans le développement n'y sont pas cités. La forme de citations des auteurs dans le texte mérite d'être harmonisée. Les références bibliographiques sont donc à reprendre entièrement suivant les nouvelles normes du CAMES</b>	

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

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

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

**C'est un sujet pertinent. Il est d'actualité. L'auteur en a une bonne compréhension. Mais le développement, la chronologie et l'agencement des idées, la cohérence et la logique, le style de français, les transitions et les connecteurs logiques ne sont pas bien utilisés. Le résumé est étriqué et ne rend pas compte du développement du sujet. Il y a eu trop de répétitions.**

**Il faut donc réorganiser le texte et rester dans le cadre du sujet. Revoir la capacité rédactionnelle en présentant un texte cohérent avec usage judicieux des transitions et des connecteurs logiques.**

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