



Paper: “Vécu de la réalité post-carcérale et réinsertion socioprofessionnelle des ex-détenus de la prison centrale de Yaoundé”

Submitted: 12 April 2025

Accepted: 20 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Adolf Mote

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n17p114

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tabue Defo Fabrice Rocard
Université de Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Henriette Kepsou
Université de Yaoundé 1, Cameroun

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/05/2025
Manuscript Title: VÉCU DE LA RÉALITÉ POST-CARCÉRALE ET RÉINSERTION SOCIO-PROFESSIONNELLE DES EX-DÉTENUS DE LA PRISON CENTRALE DE YAOUNDÉ	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Absence de congruence entre le titre et le contenu	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé n'obéit à aucun canon scientifique. L'introduction est vague et centrée sur les généralités dont elle se contente de faire une revue de littérature	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
À aucun moment elle n'aborde la spécificité qui devrait être l'essence de cet article. Absence de problème de recherche, de question et d'objectif de recherche. Les paragraphes ne sont pas bien construits. Sans transition et rapport entre eux. Vu qu'il n'y a pas d'objectif de recherche, la méthodologie n'a aucune orientation et on ne peut accorder aucun crédit aux résultats car la démarche n'est pas scientifique.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les résultats ne sont pas clairs. Sans objectif de recherche, ce qui est présenté comme étant des résultats n'a aucune valeur scientifique	
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>	
<i>Bien revoir quelques references</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):

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: TABUE DEFO Fabrice Rocard	
University/Country: Yaoundé-1-Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/05/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/05/2025
Manuscript Title: vécu de la réalité post-carcérale et réinsertion socio-professionnelle des ex-détenus de la prison centrale de Yaoundé.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:---02.---73.04.2025---	
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:	

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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le titre est claire et scientifique. Cependant, il faut le situer dans un domaine précis pour le rendre encore digeste.</i>	4/5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est accez claire mais, il faut le réorganiser et surtout verifier les conjuguésons.</i>	4.5
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4.5

La littérature est bien organisée. Je propose encore de la rendre plus riche. Il serait important d'utiliser les récents résultats sur la question. Le problème de l'étude est très plat et vague. Bien vouloir le reformuler.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'étude s'inscrit dans quel domaine de recherche. Il est nécessaire de renforcer les critères d'inclusions.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les statistiques présentées ne sont pas bien organisées (lire les remarques dans le texte).</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion est bien rédigée. Je propose d'inclure les recommandations et limites dans le texte et de renforcer les résultats.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références sont bien citées mais il faudra plus uniformiser les normes (utiliser une seule édition)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Oui. Il faudra intégrer les modifications mentionnées dans le texte.
Return for major revision and resubmission	Ouui
Reject	No

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): les auteurs de l'étude doivent revoir les références citées dans le texte. Ils doivent faire relire le texte pour correction grammaticale.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: