

Paper: “Contribution des Coopératives à l’Amélioration des Conditions de Vie des Coopérateurs au Burundi”

Submitted: 29 June 2022

Accepted: 26 July 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Alexis Ndabarushimana

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p102](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p102)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelilah Meddich
University Cadi Ayyad of Marrakech, Morocco

Reviewer 2: 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: Meddich Abdelilah	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/01/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <i>Renaissance des Coopératives et Développement Communautaire au Burundi : Analyse de la Contribution de la Coopérative REMA TWITEZIMBERE à l'Amélioration des Conditions de Vie des Coopérateurs en Commune Mutaho</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1046/22	
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
Yes the title is adequate, but better to reduce it, it is too long	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The results are presented in two lines in the summary and in a global manner without any attractive numerical illustration (give some numbers).	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Very few grammatical errors were found, the manuscript is well written	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Yes, it is satisfying	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Yes they are well presented and commented	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Yes it's well presented and the authors can better reduce it	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
To be reworked in the text and in the list of bibliographic references according to the instructions of the journal (see my remarks raised in the text	

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):

Dear authors, please see my underlined remarks in the text for satisfaction

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is interesting and well written. Please the authors are invited to rework the form of the manuscript and satisfy the requested remarks before its publication