

**Paper: “Pouvoir et Action Publique: Cristallisation des Politiques Publiques et Prélude à la Solution des Problèmes Publics”**

**Submitted: 04 October 2022**

**Accepted: 17 December 2022**

**Published: 31 December 2022**

Corresponding Author: Louis Valentin Mballa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p17](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p17)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Armand Elono Essono

Institut des Relations Internationales du Cameroun (IRIC)

Reviewer 2: Mambou Jean-Romuald

Université Denis SASSOU-N’GUESSO de Kintélé, République du Congo

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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. Armand Elono Essono	
University/Country: Institut des Relations Internationales du Cameroun (IRIC)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/Nov./2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Pouvoir et action publique : cristallisation des politiques publiques et prélude à la solution des problèmes publics</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1067_22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Le titre est clair</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est consistant</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Bon langage écrit</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <b>La méthodologie analytique est claire</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Le débat est pertinent</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Bonnes conclusions</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bibliographie pertinente</i>	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>XXXXX</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
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 2022

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: 02/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/12/2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Pouvoir et action publique : cristallisation des politiques publiques et prélude à la solution des problèmes publics</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1067/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/</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] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Oui le titre est clair et est coherence avec le contenu. C'est un sujet d'actualité lié à la gouvernance</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Non le resumé n'est pas complét. Il mérite d'être amélioré en ajoutant ces éléments suivants: Le résumé se structure comme l'introduction. Il exige qu'on parte du général au particulier et finir par une brève conclusion. Il faudrait donc débiter par la contextualisation du problème</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>( Le niveau en grammaire est bon</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(La méthodologie adoptée comporte quelques insuffisances au niveau de la forme car non organisée en partie avec des titres qui devraient être numérotés</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(les résultats sont à revoir car, ils ont été traité comme une discussion. L'auteur devrait présenter des numéros aux titres pour nous permettre de le suivre</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La conclusion est bonne</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Le nombre d'auteurs cités est suffisant</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):**

Travail satisfaisant dans le fond. Le style de rédaction et l'analyse de la question sont acceptables.

L'analyse de la problématique est satisfaisante. Cependant le travail n'a pas été organisé selon les normes de la revue ESJ. On ne voit pas les grandes parties des résultats. Les titres ne sont pas numérotés. Le texte est trop long pour un article. L'auteur a besoin de le réduire. La conclusion devrait se terminer par une ouverture.

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

L'auteur doit réduire le volume de l'article et réorganiser le travail en parties en intégrant des numéros de sorte à nous permettre de suivre le passage de la méthodologie aux résultats.



## ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: <b>MAMBOU Jean-Romuald</b>	
University/Country: <b>Université Denis SASSOU-N'GUESSO de Kintélé (République du Congo)</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>2 December 2022</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>15 December 2022</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Pouvoir et action publique : cristallisation des politiques publiques et prélude à la solution des problèmes publics</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1067/22</b>	
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: <b>Yes/No</b>	
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] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) Oui, le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. / Yes, The title is clear in line with the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments) l'article ne respecte pas le format classique d'un article scientifique. il s'agit plus d'un cours théorique sur l'action publique. / The article does not respect the classic format of a scientific article. It is more of a theoretical course on public action.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>L'article contient beaucoup de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans cet article / The article contains a lot of grammar and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Oui. La méthodologie est clairement expliquée. / Yes, the methodology is clearly explained.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Il n'y a aucun résultat; car l'article n'est pas une étude scientifique avec collecte de données dont il faudrait par la suite interpréter. / There are no results ; because, the article is not a scientific study with collection of data which it would then be necessary to interpret.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Oui, la conclusion et le résumé son en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article. / Yes, the conclusion and the summary are in line with the content of the article.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Oui /yes.</b>	

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

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

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

*L'auteur devrait enrichir son travail théorique par des études de cas pratiques qui permettraient de vérifier les théories avancées. / The author should enrich his theoretical work with practical case studies that would verify the advanced theories.*

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



---

**6 REASONS TO  
PUBLISH WITH ESJ**

- Visibility
- Agility
- Internationalisation
- Quality
- Transparency
- Open Access



# EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL