



Paper: “The Right to a Fair Trial Within a Reasonable Time Under Burundian Law”

Submitted: 20 December 2024

Accepted: 26 May 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Noel Ndikumasabo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n17p53

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ndock S. Nicolas
University of Ngaoundere, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Bezabh Abebe Bahru
University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Reviewer 3: Giuseppe Cataldi
University of Naples “L’Orientale”, Italy

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Giuseppe Cataldi	
University/Country: University of Napoli L'Orientale Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 16 May 2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The right to a fair trial within a reasonable time under Burundian law	
ESJ Manuscript Number: LV0108	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The content develops what is announced in the title	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
Yes, it is a well done summary of what follows. I have highlighted the necessity of avoiding repetitions (see attachment)	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Very few, I have put in yellow or in red what I found	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Yes, even too many times repeated	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>Yes, not particularly original but correct</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>I appreciated the clearness and the coherence</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The principal results of Case Law from main Internationals Tribunals are quoted and analyzed</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):

Just to read again in order to avoid repetitions and some minor errors. Not necessary to constantly repeat: “we will analyze that and then this...”

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Bezabh Abebe Bahru	
University/Country: University of Gondar	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: April 6/2025
Manuscript Title: The Problem of Being Judged Within a Reasonable Time Under Burundian Law	
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:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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
The title is broad and lacks specificity. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which aspect of the trial process does it address? [Criminal cases or civil cases]• Which party is the title intended to focus on? [Applicant/defendant or accused/prosecutor]• Does “The Problem of Being Judged” solely pertain to the court trial process?• Which branch of law is being discussed? [Civil procedure law or criminal procedure law]• In general, the title should clearly convey the subject matter of the article..	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This abstract is overly lengthy and contains repetitive analysis. I recommend making it more concise.</i> • <i>Most importantly, the abstract fails to clearly present the research findings. Overall, it reads more like a research proposal. The object of the article lacks clarity; due to repetition and vague explanations, the abstract feels confusing. (Please review the highlighted sections.)</i> 	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some grammatical and errors and spelling mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>I have significant concerns regarding the research methodology. The analysis emphasizes behavioral discussions among professionals, making it challenging to gather insights on human behavior solely from documentation. Additionally, the cases referenced originate from the EU and other jurisdictions. What criteria were used to select these cases? How was the sampling conducted? Is the Burundian legal system appropriate for comparison with the experiences of EU courts?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are mixed and lack a concrete presentation of the Burundian subject matter. There is only a superficial analysis of the cases from Burundi.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion has also little concern about the concern of the case in Burundi.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references provided are reasonably adequate, but there are numerous international documents and books that could enhance the article beyond its current state.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):