

Paper: “Accompagnement psychosocial et résilience des adolescents victimes de conflit intercommunautaire Arabe-Choa et Mousgoum à Logone Birni (Cameroun)”

Submitted: 13 August 2024

Accepted: 28 October 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Sanawai David

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n32p85](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n32p85)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adjuman N'guessan Alain
Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Boto Siméone Nasolo Raoël
Bircham International University, Madagascar

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

There are no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly.

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 or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of reference 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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No comment

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

That's right. I think the title is clear and consistent with the content of the article presented.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary is clear and concise. It sets out the context of the study, the objective, the study population and the results. Unfortunately, the author did not mention the methodology used.

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

On the whole, the style used is sustained, with very correct scientific language. However, there are a few careless mistakes that need to be corrected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology used is relevant, but there are a few shortcomings.

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

The structuring of the article requires some adaptation of the theoretical part. It is preferable to integrate the "definition of concepts" into the section reserved for the "literature review" to avoid duplication and, of course, for greater coherence.

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

That's right. The conclusion summarises the main points of the study

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Not at all. The list of bibliographical references absolutely must be revised. Not all the articles in this list appear in the content of the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

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

3

*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):

Re-reading to correct a few careless mistakes and wording errors

As far as the theoretical model is concerned (Boris Cyrulnik's model of residence and attachment), you need to justify the relevance of your choice.

Methodology: there is confusion about the approach used (qualitative versus quantitative).

The sample. Are you talking about a sample of 10 teenagers and a sample of 30 teenagers? Please clarify!

There was no rigorous analysis of the content of the interviews. You can't just use extracts from interviews to draw conclusions! Content analysis must comply with a certain scientific methodology, which should be included in your analyses.
