

Paper: “Analyse des problèmes liés au parcours juridique des victimes des violences sexuelles dans la province de la Tshopo en République Démocratique du Congo”

Submitted: 03 August 2021

Accepted: 25 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Augustin Mukiekie Tshite

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p214

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nanan Gerard
Felix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Pascal Adje
Université Felix Houphouet-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Yannick Tamo Fogue
Université de Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: NANAN DOH NGUESSAN GERARD	
University/Country: FELIX HOUPHOUET BOIGNY/ CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received:04/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Analyse des problèmes liés au parcours juridique des victimes de violences sexuelles dans la province de la Tshopo en République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0849/21	
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]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Le titre est clair et conforme au contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Le résumé présente les objectifs et les principaux résultats. Mais certains éléments de la méthode de recherche comme la technique d'échantillonnage, le guide d'entretien, la recherche documentaire, et les techniques d'analyse des données ne sont pas présentés dans le résumé même dans le corps de l'article.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
L'article présente des fautes. Une rélecture s'impose. Aussi, il faut uniformiser le caractère du texte dans son ensemble. Certains paragraphes sont en Times New Roman 12 et d'autres en Times New Roman 11.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
La méthode de recherche n'est pas présentée clairement. Les méthodes de recueil des données doivent être présentées clairement ainsi que leur application dans le cadre de la conduite de cette recherche en précisant comment elles se complètent ou comblent leurs insuffisances. Il faut aussi présenter clairement la technique d'échantillonnage, le guide d'entretien, la recherche documentaire, et les techniques d'analyse des données. Par ailleurs, dans l'introduction plusieurs informations sont données aux lecteurs sans source (affirmations gratuites). Pourtant ces informations participent à la formulation de la problématique.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont clairs et ne présentent pas d'erreurs.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion resume les grandes lignes de l'article.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références sont présentées de façon appropriée et ont un lien avec l'objet d'étude.	

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):

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: ADJE N'GORAN PASCAL	
University/Country: Université Felix Houphouet-Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 3 mars 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 mars 2021
Manuscript Title: Représentations sociales de la pollution de l'air intérieur et pratiques sociales des malades d'asthme de la commune de Yopougon (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0318/21	
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
<i>Sujet clair et original. Acceptable</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Résumé acceptable. Les observations ont été prises en compte</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Texte acceptable les fautes relevées dans la première correction ont été prises en compte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3,5
<i>Les observations sont prises en compte. Toutefois, la justification du site d'étude demeure imprecise. Donc elle est à revoir</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Acceptable</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion intéressante et bien Claire</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Acceptable mais quelques observations à prendre en compte avant la publication</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: TAMO FOGUE Yannick	
University/Country: Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/08/201	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/08/201
Manuscript Title: Analyse des problèmes liés au parcours juridique des victimes de violences sexuelles dans la province de la Tshopo en République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
Le titre cadre bien avec la problématique et est suffisamment informative sur la question du parcours juridique des victimes de violences sexuelles au Congo.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Le résumé est complet. On y trouve clairement l'objectif visé, le problème, la méthode (sources d'information), le résultat et les implications.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
On note beaucoup d'erreurs grammaticales et orthographiques, ainsi que de syntaxe dans les parties résultat et discussion.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthodologie est d'une très grande originalité. En effet, l'on y circonscrit clairement et avec justification le contexte géographique, la population et l'échantillon de l'étude. N'en déplaise, le « Tableau 1 » et la « figure 1 » me semblent une redondance. Le caractère empirico-inductif de l'approche utilisée (dite « Grounded theory ») pour la collecte et l'analyse des matériaux est intéressant.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Les résultats sont certes significatifs. Mais il semble nécessaire de réduire l'utilisation des expressions comme « L'étude a révélé » « L'étude a identifié ». Les onze (11) points relevés comme problèmes ont des contenus très similaires et redondants. L'on vous recommande de cumuler certains qui ont quasiment les mêmes contenus. La discussion est effectivement liée aux résultats obtenus.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Les conclusions comportent les éléments requis	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Oui. On recense au moins 48 références.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Réserver une section après l'introduction pour expliquer clairement l'approche « Grounded theory » ;
- Limiter la méthodologie à : Population ; Matériel et Procédure.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 05/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/08/2021
Manuscript Title: “Analyse des problèmes liés au parcours juridique des victimes de violences sexuelles dans la province de la Tshopo en République Démocratique du Congo”	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0849/21	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Il y a beaucoup de problèmes de langue dans ce manuscrit. C'est l'une de ses faiblesses majeures!</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Votre manuscrit a de gros problèmes de style et de fautes. Je vous suggère de vous faire lire par des tiers!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: