



Paper: “Lorsque le symbolique transcende les frontières terrestres entre le Cameroun et ses voisins : la contribution des mariages transfrontaliers à l’intégration sous-régionale en Afrique centrale”

Submitted: 15 October 2025

Accepted: 05 December 2025

Published: 31 December 2025

Corresponding Author: Yvan Nathanael Noubissi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n35p68

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gnamien Konan Bah Modeste
Jean Lorougnon Guede University, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Munenge Mudage Florent
Université Officielle de Bukavu, RDC

Reviewer 3: 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: Munenge MUDAGE Florent	
University/Country: Université Officielle de Bukavu, RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 05. 11. 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 09.11.2025
Manuscript Title: « Lorsque le symbolique transcende les frontières terrestres entre le Cameroun et ses voisins : la contribution des mariages transfrontaliers à l'intégration sous-régionale en Afrique centrale. »	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1103/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est bon et interessant. Il ouvre sur des questions souvent oubliées dans les processus d'intégration régionale	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui.	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	3

Oui. Je propose qu'il soit confié à une expertise pour corriger ces fautes de français	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Non. A mon avis la méthodologie a été annoncée en partie. Et dans le corps du travail, l'auteur semble ignorer sa propre méthodologie	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats ne sont pas aussi bien articulés par rapport à la question de recherche soulevée	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui, partiellement	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Oui. Mais mal notées</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):

A l'auteur, je suggère de revoir la partie sur la méthodologie qui semble moins pertinente. Il doit intégrer des éléments sur les outils de collecte des données dont le questionnaire d'enquête.

Il doit également présenter les résultats en tenant compte des enquêtes menées. Il va les analyser avant de les discuter. CFR remarques dans le travail.

J'ai réalisé que l'auteur s'est beaucoup focalisé sur la socio-anthropologie en développant plus des aspects explicatifs des mariages dans sa zone d'étude. Il donne moins d'espaces ou pas aux mariages transfrontaliers. Ils ne sont même pas évoqués en termes d'exemples. C'est à partir de ces exemples que l'auteur devra analyser l'impact de ces mariages sur l'intégration régionale en Afrique centrale. Et là, il faudrait trouver un cas précis d'intégration régionale pour l'expérimentation.

Je propose que l'auteur s'intéresse aux mariages transnationaux.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Aucun commentaire

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: 06/11/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/11/2025
Manuscript Title: “When the symbolic transcends the earthly borders between Cameroon and its neighbors: the contribution of cross-border marriages to subregional integration in Central Africa”.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1103/25	
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: No	
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 title is clear, unambiguous, and consistent with the content of the text. It is concise, as it presents only one object of study (interstate marriage between natives and non-natives in the border area). However, it contains a grammatical error: the author placed a period at the end of the title. Since a title is not a complete sentence, it should not end with a period.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract presents the context and the object of the study (a comprehensive examination of cross-border marriage in the southern and northern regions of Cameroon). It mentions the methodological approach, a qualitative study based on observation and interviews. Moreover, it specifies the theoretical framework of analysis (the theory of neo-regionalism) and highlights the key elements of the findings.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The article is generally well written; the sentences are clear and unambiguous. However, there are some formal errors, such as the omission of the authors' names and the publication dates in the various tables and illustrations, which must be corrected by the author.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The methodology contains irregularities at several levels. The section corresponding to "Methods" in the IMRAD structure is retitled by the author as "Data Collection Methods." At this point, a confusion arises because, in the IMRAD framework, the "Methods" section should include the sampling methods and techniques as well as the theoretical framework through which the study data will be analyzed. The author mentioned the analytical theory " <i>neo-regionalism</i> " in the introduction, whereas it should have been presented and explained in the "Methods" section. The author should specify the founding scholar of this theory and, most importantly, explain how it serves as a framework for analyzing the study's data. In addition, this section should outline the structure adopted for presenting the research results. Moreover, the author does not specify the types of observation (participant or direct) and interviews (structured, semi-structured, or open) used in the study, as required by the conventions of qualitative research.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
the results lack survey data typical of the qualitative approach adopted in this study. The interviews should include verbatim excerpts or diagrams that support the arguments developed in each section. Observation should also be complemented by photographs of meaningful scenes. Only one verbatim excerpt was identified in the text, which is clearly insufficient for a qualitative study focusing on a social phenomenon such as marriage.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion addresses the summary of the research findings, the methodological review, the theoretical assessment, and the lessons learned from the study. In light of these elements, the conclusion meets the required standards and is well written.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The bibliography is excessive and does not reflect all the citations contained in the document. Furthermore, it contains irregularities in punctuation. It is advised to put a period/full stop at the end of each bibliographic reference. Above all, the title 'Bibliographic References' (or 'References') is the most suitable for this type of exercise (only the authors cited in the document should appear in the bibliographic references).	

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):

The author must mandatorily correct the theoretical and methodological indications of the document. Furthermore, they should consolidate their discussion with references to the authors

from their logical framework of analysis. They must lead the discussion around the key points of the results. The discussion presented is insufficient and lacks depth in the analysis. It uses the same volume of writing as the conclusion

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: GNAMIEN Konan Bah Modeste	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire / Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé de Daloa	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/11/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2025
Manuscript Title: « Lorsque le symbolique transcende les frontières terrestres entre le Cameroun et ses voisins : la contribution des mariages transfrontaliers à l'intégration sous-régionale en Afrique centrale. »	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1102/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
Le titre est clair et reflète le contenu	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
Le résumé n'énonce pas clairement le cadre disciplinaire de l'étude. Il s'agit d'une étude sociologique ou anthropologique. Il doit également aborder les personnes interrogées.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
La méthodologie ne précise pas le type d'étude, la nature de l'étude et le champ disciplinaire dans lequel l'étude s'inscrit. Le mode d'échantillonnage n'est pas précisé ainsi que la technique d'analyse des données. Préciser également les théories mobilisées pour l'étude. Vu que l'étude met en évidence des peuples transfrontaliers, il serait intéressant d'avoir une carte géographique pour situer les deux zones.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
Les résultats devraient présentées beaucoup plus de Verbatims pour justifier les analyses. Il n'y a aucune comparaison des auteurs cités dans la discussion avec les résultats obtenus.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
La conclusion reflète les résultats. Mais les manquements au niveau méthodologique précisés pus haut affecte sa qualité. Ces éléments doivent apparaitre dans la conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Les références sont compréhensives et appropriées.	

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):

Prière prendre en compte les observations pour améliorer la qualité du document, le sujet est pertinent

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: