

Paper: “Evaluation de l’Etat de la Gestion des Excrétas dans la Ville de Bukavu en République Démocratique du Congo : Cas de la Commune de Kadutu”

Submitted: 14 March 2022

Accepted: 16 May 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Jean De Dieu Mangambu Mokoso

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p146](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n15p146)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cishunguluka Kanani
Université Officielle de Bukavu, Rd. Congo

Reviewer 2: Diarra Moussa
Université Jean Lorougnon GUEDE, Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Gnagne Agness Yves
Universite Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

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: Amos CISHUNGULUKA KANANI	
University/Country: Université Officielle de Bukavu, RD. CONGO	
Date Manuscript Received: 18.3.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.3.2022
Manuscript Title: ETAT DE LIEU DE LA GESTION DES EXCRETAS DANS LA VILLE DE BUKAVU (RDC): cas de la commune de Kadutu	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
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</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>	

It requires minors modifications to be clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The objectives explained in the abstract must be identical to those which are given in the text	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
YES, they must be corrected as well as they are underlined in the whole text. All the text must be red in order to introduce in a good style	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The sample method selection is not clearly given The analysis methods are not précised. The authors must clarify their type of analysis	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
They are clear and logically presented, but must be corrected in their interpretation. The discussion of the results must be redone	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>All the references must be redone, referring to the authors guiding. They must read the ESJ guide authors.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article must be revised: résumé et abstract, methodology(sample and analysis method), discussion of results, references.

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: DIARRA MOUSSA	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 10 Avril 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14 Avril 2022
Manuscript Title: Etat de lieu de la gestion des excréta dans la ville de Bukavu (RD. Congo) : Cas de la commune de Kadutu	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0361/22	
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.	3

<i>I would like him to review the title by the one proposed</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents the objects, methods and results However, it does not need to mention in its text: Goals:..... Methodology and Results:conclusion:..... In addition, he must resume the summary by deleting words or sentences that are not necessary</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are grammatical and spelling errors in this article that the applicant must take into account</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Study methods are clearly explained. however, grammar and spelling errors exist that the applicant must take into account</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors but contain spelling and grammatical errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions or summary are not accurate and supported by the content. Because no survey results appear in the summary</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>yes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject treated by the author has a scientific significance. However, the author must take into account all the words or groups of words mentioned in green. he must also correct any spelling and grammatical errors found in his manuscript. The recommendations are to be taken in the revision part. He must also resume the summary by showing the results of the surveys.

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: GNAGNE AGNESS YVES	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE NANGUI ABROGOUA	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/04/2022
Manuscript Title: Etat de lieu de la gestion des excréta dans la ville de Bukavu (RD. Congo) : Cas de la commune de Kadutu.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> 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/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> 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.	2

The title is not Claire. The title could be proposed: Gestion des excretas dans la ville de Bukavu (RD. Congo) : Cas de la commune de Kadutu.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
They do not have to indicate the different steps in the summary. It is therefore necessary to write without the titles	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
The level of language needs to be reviewed. Sentences whose meanings are not always perceptible	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
La méthodologie de cette etude n'est pas clairement expliquée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
The methodology of this study is not clearly explained	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
The conclusion does not reflect the objectives of the study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
The references cited in the discussion are not appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In order to evaluate the waste management carried out in the municipality, it is necessary to work on the following basic steps:

- 1-present the state of affairs in the management of waste in the municipality
- 2-the causes of this bad management
- 3- the environmental and social consequences
- 4- measures for the improvement of excreta management

Therefore, the theme that contains the objectives presented below is:

Management of excreta in the city of Bukavu (DR. Congo): Case of the commune of Kadutu

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: