EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
16 YEARS

Paper: **"State Responsibility and Accountability Mechanisms in the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons under Contemporary International Law: The case of Cameroon"**

Submitted: 17 November 2025
Accepted: 30 January 2026
Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Ngueumaga Kameni V Gerard Tresor

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n2p31

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Bezabh Abebe Bahiru
Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China

Reviewer 2: Fatos Haziri
University of Pristina, Kosovo

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 Bahiru**	
University/Country: **Zhejiang Normal University, Jinhua, China**	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/29/2025
Manuscript Title: **Reassessing state responsibility for the protection of internally displaced persons under contemporary International Law: normative evolution, implementation gaps, and accountability mechanisms.**	
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: **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.	**3**
The title is broader in scope. • Normative evaluation_ this aspect requires a comprehensive review of legal and doctrinal assessments. • Implementation gap_ evaluating practical applications necessitates extensive data from various legal systems and a comparison of their feasibility. • Accountability mechanisms_ the analysis of supervisory systems and accountability measures also demands data collection and a comparative evaluation between international legal frameworks and the experiences of different national systems.	

Considering the complexities of this extensive title and the wealth of existing research in this area, it may be more effective to revise the title to focus on a specific research topic and limited aspects of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). This would help ensure that the research objectives are clear and avoid reiterating previous findings in a new format.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**3**
The abstract lacks to present the methodology, approach and sample of the study.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Despite some editorial errors, the manuscript has no significant grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Even though, the author prefer to use doctrinal approach by aiming to explore normative evolution, evaluate the practice and explore the challenge. Such aims require coherence identification of the target countries to reach credible finding. Despite its ambitious to present 'reframe of the debate', the daft lacks to present new perspective in detail. It rather prefer randomly mentions countries general experience. The author should select relevant legal sources and precedents that effectively support the conclusions. Properly categorizing and analyzing these sources could enhance the quality and credibility of the research.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
The analysis lacks specificity and persuasion in citing the legal provisions of the national states experience, court case decisions or any sources to analyzing rigorously. Setting a new perspective requires detail splitting the previous researches with necessary strong argumentation to show the new paradigm. Generally, the research is shallow and prefer to generalize without great deal of specific analysis.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion is presented in accurately by referring the body of the research. However, there are few points that had not dealt with the analysis part.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The list of references are comprehensive, however according to the title it require rigorous review of the other previous researches, reports and regional and international reports and so on.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is well-edited and of high quality. The title reflects an ambitious scope for the research. To enhance the methodology, the author should evaluate whether a doctrinal approach is adequate for achieving the objective of "reframing the debate in the field." While doctrinal research may not necessitate sampling, it should not be arbitrary. Furthermore, the analysis and

conclusions are overly simplistic and fail to provide new insights. Considering the wealth of existing research in this area, the author must compellingly present a fresh perspective within a novel framework and make a significant contribution to the literature.

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: Fatos Haziri	
University/Country: "Hasan Prishtina"	
Date Manuscript Received: 28.12.2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Reassessing state responsibility for the protection of internally displaced persons under contemporary International Law: normative evolution, implementation gaps, and accountability mechanisms.	
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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
(Please insert your comments) **The title is concise, clear, and accurately represents the thematic focus and substantive content of the article; it effectively prepares the reader for the discussion that follows.**	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
(Please insert your comments) **The abstract clearly outlines the research objectives, the methods applied, and the principal results. It provides the reader with an accurate preview of the article's scope and contributions.**	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
(Please insert your comments) **There are several minor grammatical errors and spelling inconsistencies throughout the article, which should be reviewed and corrected for clarity and accuracy.**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
(Please insert your comments) **The study methods are explained clearly and are presented in a manner that allows the reader to understand the research approach.**	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
(Please insert your comments) **The results are clear and free of obvious errors. Including a brief discussion on their limitations or robustness could enhance the analytical depth of the section.**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
(Please insert your comments) **The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content. However, a brief expansion on the implications or recommendations for further research could strengthen the overall impact of the closing section.**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
(Please insert your comments) *The reference list is sufficiently comprehensive and appropriately reflects the relevant literature in the field. The sources are pertinent and contribute to the scholarly credibility of the article.*	

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):