

Paper: “L’édifice Filmique Russe: Laboratoire d’Un Autre Futur en Afrique”

Submitted: 16 January 2023

Accepted: 27 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Qemal Affagnon

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p104

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ousmane Berepa
Institut Universitaire Panafricain, Benin

Reviewer 2: De-Laure Laurent Faton
Institut Universitaire Panafricain (IUP), Benin

Reviewer 3: Moussa Martin Tessougue
Université des Sciences Sociales et de Gestion de Bamako (USSGB) au Mali

Reviewer 4: Adil Bouyahya
CRMEF de Fes Maroc

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: BOUYAHYA Adil	
University/Country: CRMEF de FES MAROC.	
Date Manuscript Received:03/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: L'édifice filmique russe: laboratoire d'un autre futur en Afrique.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0162/23	
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.	3

<i>L'intitulé est adéquat et limpide à la teneur de l'article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>La problématique, la méthodologie ainsi que la démarche procédurale sont nuancées dès l'abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Le texte est, en substance, convenable. Il faut prêter attention à souligner le mot <i>TOURIST</i> en italique. Du fait que c'est un titre de film.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Les démarches d'investigations semblent visiblement explicitées.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les débouchées paraissent convenables. Aucune erreur de jugement.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Les conclusions et le résumé sont véritables et supportés par la thématique de la réflexion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Par contre, les références bibliographiques exigent d'être actualisées pour un plus de fiabilité.</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):

En substance, l'article recouvre la panoplie des exigences de l'authenticité dans la démarche de la recherche scientifique. Hormis la bibliographie à actualiser et les quelques mises en page à opérer, tout semble à propos.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: TESSOUGUE Moussa dit Martin	
University/Country: Université des Sciences Sociales et de Gestion de Bamako (USSGB) au Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/03/2023
Manuscript Title: L'édifice filmique russe: laboratoire d'un autre futur en Afrique	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	2
<i>There is confusion between the title and the text.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>Any methods in abstract</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>yes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>No! The study methods are absents in the text.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>The results are like a reporting not from a study method!</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>It is so fare from the content!</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references are not precise!</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)

The text will be writing such a scientific paper not like a reporting in newspapers!

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr Ousmane C. BEREPA	
University/Country: Institut Universitaire Panafricain/BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/01/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/01/2023
Manuscript Title: L'édifice filmique russe: laboratoire d'un autre futur en Afrique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0162/23	
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
<i>(Le titre est Claire et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article.)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Le résumé indique de quel type de recherche, il est question. La méthode choisie est en adéquation pour une réflexion épistémologique)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(L'auteur doit faire l'effort de revoir quelques coquilles.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Rien à signaler)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Il est vrai que les résultats sont clairs et ne contiennent pas d'erreurs, mais pour une réflexion épistémologique, il reste discutable.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Rien à signaler)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Pour ce qui concerne les références, c'est une question d'école et d'espace scientifique. Ici, dans l'espace du Conseil Africain et Mlagache de l'Enseignement Supérieur, les titres des ouvrages son ten italique, et pour ce qui est des articles, ils sont mis entre guillemets. Ce qui n'est pas le cas. Peut être que dans votre espace, cela se fait tel que l'auteur les a présentés)</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):

Sur la forme, l'auteur a certainement pris soin de respecter les instructions de la revue. Sur le fond l'article, apporte un contenu nouveau et une réflexion épistémologique enrichissante. Il contribue à l'avancement du champ de connaissance et de recherché jetant un nouvel éclairage sur la problématique de la production filmique en Afrique à partir de l'édifice russe. Cependant, en ce qui concerne la qualité et la portée du cadre théorique, les concepts ne sont pas clairement définis, pour ne pas dire n'ont pas connus d'éclairage. L'auteur a omis de surcroît l'ancrage théorique, si bien qu'il est difficile d'évaluer la coherence entre les théories et la problématique. La bibliographie ne comportant aucun ouvrage filmique en Afrique constitue un handicap pour un travail de réflexion sur le cinema en Afrique. Elle doit être enrichie.