

Paper: “**Du jeu de l’inclusion et de l’exclusion dans De purs hommes de Mbougar Sarr et Femme nue, femme noire de Calixthe Beyala”**

Submitted: 18 November 2023

Accepted: 23 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Maurice Gning

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n35p58

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received:23/11/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/11/23
Manuscript Title: Du jeu de l'inclusion et de l'exclusion dans <i>De purs hommes de Mbougar Sarr et Femme nue, femme noire de Calixthe Beyala</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1206/23	
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.	5
Le titre de l'article est clair	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé ne fait pas mention de la méthodologie de recollection des données qui ont servi pour l'élaboration de l'article. L'auteur devrait peut être mentionner qu'il s'agit d'une Méthodologie de révision de littérature</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Très bonne expression du langage écrit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La méthodologie n'est pas clairement expliquée. Cette mention peut être faite dans l'introduction, du fait que l'article étant donné sa nature, n'a pas tellement besoin d'une section spéciale sur la méthodologie	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Du point de vue analytique, l'article apporte des éléments très intéressants	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Je suggère aux auteurs sectionner le contenu de l'article en plusieurs sous-titres ou chaque sous-titre représente une idée précise. Ceci pourrait faciliter la lecture et la digestion du contenu de l'article.