



Paper: “Estime de Soi et Persistance des Étudiantes en STIM à l’ENSAI de Ngaoundéré au Cameroun”

Submitted: 18 July 2025

Accepted: 18 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: David Ébongué

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n26p105

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Georges Kpazaï
Laurentian University, Canada

Reviewer 2: Kbibch Abdelouahed
Académie régionale de l’éducation et de la formation, Rabat, Maroc

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: Georges Kpazai	
University/Country: Laurentian University / Canada	
Date Manuscript Received: Sept 4, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: Sept. 11, 2025
Manuscript Title: Estime de Soi et Persistance des Étudiantes en STIM à l'ENSAI de Ngaoundéré au Cameroun Self – Esteem and Persistence of STEM Students at ENSAI in Ngaoundéré, Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0807/25	
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.

<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.	4
<i>Un titre bref et concis.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Rien à dire</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Excellent!</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>La méthodologie est bien décrite</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Très bien!</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Le contenu de la conclusion et du résumé sont bien appropriés</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Oui, conforme aux norms de la 7^e version de APA</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):

Excellent manuscript à la fois dans le fond que dans la forme. Félicitations. Des corrections mineures sont suggérées (voir l'article annoté).