

**Paper: “Violences liées aux accusations de sorcellerie et vulnérabilité de la femme âgée en contexte burkinabé”**

**Submitted: 05 August 2021**

**Accepted: 12 November 2021**

**Published: 30 November 2021**

Corresponding Author: Léopold Badolo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n38p43

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tayeb Boutbouqalt  
UAE, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Ismaïla Sene  
Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor, Sénégal

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Karima Laamiri  
Université Abdelmalek Essaadi Tangier, Morocco

# 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: <i>Dr. Tayeb BOUTBOUQALT</i>	
University/Country: <i>UAE/Morocco</i>	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Violences et vulnérabilité de la femme âgée en contexte burkinabé</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
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: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## 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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>The title is clear enough and it is adequate to the content of this article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents partially objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article which needs to be restructured from a general presentation point of view : the literature review should be expanded and detached from the introduction</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods are explained clearly enough.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results are clear but not sufficient: quantitative and qualitative analyzes need to be further developed.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate but not sufficiently exposed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references are complete and more or less appropriate.</i>	

**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: Ismaïla SENE	
University/Country: Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor, Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 aout 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 aout 2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Violences et vulnérabilité de la femme âgée en contexte burkinabé</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.08.2021	
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/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

Le titre de l'article est clair mais pour qu'il soit plus adéquat avec le contenu, l'auteur gagnerait à y intégrer l'idée de violences liées aux accusations de sorcellerie.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
Dans l'objet de l'article l'auteur reste vague. Il parle de la violence sur les femmes âgées sans évoquer l'idée de violences consecutives aux accusations de sorcellerie. Le contenu des resultats gagnerait à être présenté avec plus de details dans le resumé.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Le style d'écriture est clair et les fautes sont rares	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
Des compléments d'informations sont nécessaires. L'auteur doit préciser si toutes les femmes ont été interrogées par questionnaire et par entretien à la fois ou bien s'il a interrogé une partie par questionnaire et une autre partie par entretien. Le nombre de personnes par instrument devrait également être précisé. Il serait aussi judicieux de décrire les conditions de l'enquête, le type d'administration (directe ou indirecte), la durée moyenne d'administration de chaque outil, etc.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
La partie résultat est peu détaillée et l'analyse du rapport entre les violences liées aux accusations de sorcellerie et la vulnérabilité chez les femmes n'est pas fournie. L'analyse séparée des données du questionnaire et des données des entretiens tend à appauvrir l'analyse. Pourquoi ne pas étoffer l'analyse des variables quantitatives par des données qualitatives? L'auteur gagnerait aussi à mieux détailler ses résultats en insistant davantage sur les espaces et auteurs des violences, les formes et indicateurs de la vulnérabilité liée aux violences consécutives aux accusations de sorcellerie. A ce propos l'analyse du vécu psychologique de la violence et du statut social de "sorciere" serait utile. J'ajoute aussi que le nombre d'entretiens réalisés (02) est trop faible pour permettre à l'auteur d'appréhender ces questions qui relèvent d'une dimension psychologique. Une meilleure analyse nécessiterait le recours à des entretiens supplémentaires. La discussion des résultats est assez simpliste, mieux articuler les références citées avec ses constats de terrain.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<b>Dans la conclusion, il serait intéressant de revenir notamment sur les résultats de la recherche et de discuter de l'intérêt de l'étude, ses limites et ses perspectives.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>

*Les références sont riches et variées. Certaines sont récentes.*

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

L'article porte sur un sujet assez original car étant peu débattu par les sciences humaines et sociales. L'auteur devra néanmoins prendre en compte les suggestions (cf. grille d'évaluation et commentaires dans le manuscrit).

Sa structure doit aussi être améliorée. Par exemple l'introduction fait plus de 50% du texte. Je suggère à l'auteur de réduire l'introduction et d'ajouter une partie problématique (après l'introduction) qui contiendra la synthèse de certains éléments de littérature ainsi que la problématique à proprement parlée.

### **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: karima LAAMIRI	
University/Country: Université Abdelmalek Essaadi Tangier, Morroco	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/08	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/08
Manuscript Title: <b>Violences et vulnérabilité de la femme âgée en contexte burkinabé</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0855/21	
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>4</b>
<i>Le titre est assez clair.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Le respecte le contenu, méthodes et résultats.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Des fautes d'orthographe à revoir. Revoir la mise en page.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Il manqué la transcription du corpus de la recherche.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Résultats assez clairs.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Un grand déséquilibre entre la longueur des parties de l'article rend le contenu difficile à saisir. A revoir pour mettre la conclusion en valeur.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Trop de références dans l'article ! Notes en bas de page.</i>	

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

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