

Paper: **“Culture et Modèle de l’acteur Socio-économique : Cas du Congo”**

Submitted: 05 December 2020

Accepted: 11 May 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Hilarion Mfouka

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p192

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kabikissa Florent Jean Désiré
Université Marien Ngouabi, Brazzaville, Congo

Reviewer 3: Kiambu Jacques
Université du Moyen-Lualaba, République Démocratique du Congo

Reviewer 4: Bruno Samba
Université Marien Ngouabi, Congo

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: KABIKISSA Florent Jean Désiré	
University/Country: Université Marien NGOUABI – Brazzaville - CONGO	
Date Manuscript Received: 03 février 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 février 2021
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Culture et modèle de l'acteur socio-économique: cas du Congo	
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>Le titre est bien en rapport avec le contenu de l'article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4,5
<i>Le résumé présente très clairement l'objectif de l'étude, la méthode utilisée, ainsi que les résultats.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3,5
<i>Des améliorations sont à apporter dans le texte. L'auteur devrait les prendre en compte afin d'améliorer la version du manuscrit.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie est assez bien énoncée et expliquée.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Des erreurs sont présentes dans les résultats du tableau 9. Tableaux 3 et 4 : après un nième numéro ex aequo (par exemple 4ième et 4ième ex aequo), on passe au n+2ième numéro (6)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Oui.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2,5
<i>Certaines références (2) indiquées dans le texte ne sont pas reprises dans la bibliographie (Morin, 2010; Schutz, 1987). D'autres références sont mal écrites.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Merci de bien prendre en compte les observations et corrections en rouge dans le manuscrit. La bibliographie également mérite d'être mise à jour.

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 Received: 03/02/2021	Manuscript	Date Submitted: 24/02/2021	Review	Report
Manuscript Title: Culture et modèle de l'acteur socio-économique : cas du Congo				
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				
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Bien décrire la procédure d'échantillonnage et la méthode d'analyse des données utilisées.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	XXX
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Pourquoi vous ne présentez pas la revue de la littérature empirique ?

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: 14/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/02/2021
Manuscript Title: CULTURE ET MODELE DE L'ACTEUR SOCIO-ECONOMIQUE : CAS DU CONGO	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 83.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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 4</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>(Please insert your comments) Le titre est clair et adéqua avec le contenu du papier</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)Le résumé ne reflète pas de manière pertinente les objectifs et les résultats</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)L'article est bien écrit, le style est bon, mais une nouvelle relecture est nécessaire pour corriger quelques petites erreurs de trappe</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)L'étude est pertinente</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)Le corps du texte est correct , mais pourrait être amélioré en intégrant les travaux d'Hassan ZAOUAL sur la thématique</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) La conclusion est pertinente, elle est excellente</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) La bibliographie est riche, mais elle peut toujours être améliorée</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):

Bien que l'article semble être bien rédigé, l'auteur a tout intérêt à consulter les travaux effectués par H. Zaoual au milieu années 2000 sur cette thématique. Il aura tout à gagner.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: