

Paper: “Le Rôle de la Justice dans la Mise en Œuvre d’un Développement Durable au Burundi”

Submitted: 13 November 2023

Accepted: 20 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Prime Niyongabo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p219](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p219)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Pauline Mevah
Université de Yaoundé II, Cameroun

Reviewer 3: Marie Line Karam
Lebanese University, Lebanon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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 Mevah Bikongo Pauline	
University/Country: Université de Yaoundé II/Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 fevrier 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 février 2024
Manuscript Title: Indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire en tant que moteur de développement durable au Burundi : défis et perspectives	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OUI	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: OUI	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: OUI	

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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
L'auteur ne presente pas suffisamment comment l'indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire est le moteur du développement durable au Burundi	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
L'objet n'est pas clairement défini	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les arguments sont insuffisants	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Nous ne retrouvons pas la problématique qui guide ce travail dans l'introduction
2. L'auteur a indiqué que dans le cadre de son travail il va « faire le point sur l'interrelation entre l'indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire en tant que noyau de la justice sociale et facteur clé du développement durable au Burundi », mais nous avons recherché en vain les arguments qui militent en

faveur de cette interrelation entre indépendance de la justice et développement durable dans le travail

- 3. L'auteur n'argumente pas suffisamment pour faire comprendre comment l'indépendance de la justice impacte sur le développement durable au Burundi, la première partie du travail est très survolée**
- 4. L'auteur gagnerait à poser une problématique claire qui sera le fil conducteur de son travail, et présenter des arguments solides qui vont appuyer sa position dans les deux parties du travail**

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes but the final issue is missing

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The structure of the phrases need to be more scientific

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes but also descriptive and the Scientific plan is missing

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The reasoning is acceptable and the ideas are important. However, no clear plan.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Related to the subject but need to go further.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Very weak.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Work on the references

Work on the plan

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the paper effectively aligns with the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract of the paper succinctly outlines the objectives, methodologies, and findings of the research, providing a clear and comprehensive overview of its contents.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Regarding grammatical errors, this article is relatively free of such issues. The text maintains a commendable standard of accuracy in language usage and presentation.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods, specifically the documentary analysis approach, are elucidated clearly within the paper.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion of the paper is precise, underpinned by the content presented throughout the study.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I congratulate you on the quality of your paper; it contains very important informations and you have adhered to the standards.
