

Paper: “**Déterminants de la stabilité politique en Afrique : rôle de la fragmentation et d’abondance des ressources naturelles**”

Submitted: 12 October 2020

Accepted: 05 November 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Fanny Kabwe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n35p135

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Driss Bouyahya
University Moulay Ismail, 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!

Reviewer Name: Dr Driss Bouyahya

University/Country: Moulay Ismail University Meknes, Morocco

Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2020

Date Review Report Submitted: 01/11/2020

Manuscript Title: **Déterminants de la Stabilité politique en Afrique : rôle de la Fragmentation et d'abondance des ressources naturelles**

ESJ Manuscript Number: 1098/20

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.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

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

- Il suffit de corriger quelques erreurs.
- C'est un tres bon travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: