

**Paper: “Analyse de l’étendue des privilèges et immunités diplomatiques”**

**Submitted: 16 December 2020**

**Accepted: 21 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Jean de Dieu Ndikumana

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p79](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p79)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dionise Arakaza  
University of Burundi, Burundi

Reviewer 2: Marie Line Karam  
Lebanese University, Lebanon

# 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. Dionise ARAKAZA, PhD	
University/Country: University of Burundi	
Date Manuscript Received: 8 <sup>th</sup> January 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14 <sup>th</sup> January 2021
Manuscript Title : Analyse de l'étendue des privilèges et immunités des agents diplomatiques	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0102/21	
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>3.5</b>

I propose the title to be as follows : Analyse de l'étendue des privilèges et immunités diplomatiques/ Analysis of the scope of the diplomatic privileges and immunities	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>For the English version of the Abstract, I have given my proposal which is not far from what the author has written. However, it will be up to the author to compare and see whether my proposal can work. Overall, he has done a clear and concise piece of abstract in terms of form and content.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There was no many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. However, one can see some few words omitted and others requiring replacements. BUT the author can choose either to comply or not with my suggestions for this matter.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Methods are systematically explained along with references and sources.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clear as the article ends with concluding remarks.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion ends with answering the questions raised before the development of the article</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>I propose the author to add the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 (23<sup>rd</sup> April)</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 article is written in a concise academic manner. You are free to choose to insert my recommendations or not as your manuscript fits itself in terms of content and understandability. Those suggestions would come to embellish the form.

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

I recommend the manuscript be accepted.

# 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 Marie line Karam	
University/Country: Lebanese University	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/1/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/1/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Analyse de l'étendue des privilèges et immunités des agents diplomatiques</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0102/21	
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>3.5</b>

The title is very vague since the subject analyzed include several legal issues	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Few grammatical errors to be reviewed</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Result is clear but can be extended to additional conclusions</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Based on the scientific and academic methods of researches the references must be included in the footnotes or at the end of the study but must be more specific and rich</b>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>Y</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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