

Paper: “Enjeux de la Gestion de la Diversité dans la Performance des Ressources Humaines des Entreprises”

Submitted: 03 October 2022

Accepted: 23 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Germain Sonkeng

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p71](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p71)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kamgne Linda
Université de Dschang, Dschang, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Yao Koffi Alexandre
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

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: YAO Koffi Alexandre	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/11/2022
Manuscript Title: Gestion de la diversité et performance des ressources humaines	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1057/22	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Le titre me parait un peu vague, il faut le rendre plus précis et concis.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Le résumé est bien mené</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) le niveau de langue est soutenu hormis quelques longues phrases et une redondance d'expressions et mots. Aussi, faut-il revoir la punctuation à certains endroits.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) les méthodes sont bien adaptées et bien expliquées</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Il n'y a aucune ambiguïté dans les resultats. Mais, je souhaiterais qu'ils soient dissociés de la discussion, car la discussion semble ne pas être bien étoffée pourtant la bibliographie est conséquente.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Tout est bien mené. Il y a une conformité entre le resumé et la conclusion et le contenu de l'article. Cependant, il y a tout même quelques aspects à revoir au niveau de la conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments) Les références sont appropriées avec pour la plupart des travaux récents. Cependant, la rigueur scientifique par rapport à la citation des auteurs doit être de mise.</i>	

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):

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: KAMGNE Linda	
University/Country: Dschang/Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 2/12/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/12/22
Manuscript Title: Enjeux de la gestion de la diversité dans la performance des ressources humaines des entreprises	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre est fluide et facilite la compréhension	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La présentation sommaire des resultats est à revoir	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Très peu de fautes dans le texte	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La technique méthodologique est compréhensible. Seulement, elle peut être complétée. Revoir par exemple l'échantillonnage, qui est assez insignifiant.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La présentation des résultats et l'analyse est à revoir. Trop de citations inutiles dans certains cas, qui peuvent être représenté par des figures. Aucun pourcentage ni effectif, afin de permettre au lecteur de comparer et de mesurer les données.	
De plus la présentation des limites est bâclée.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Certaines données de la conclusion ont été sous-traitées dans la présentation des résultats	
Proposer des perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Possible amélioration en tenant compte des normes scientifiques	

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):

Le texte est fluide et compréhensible. Il présente cependant des limites importantes au niveau de la présentation des résultats qui est à revoir.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: