



**EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL**  
by European Scientific Institute



**Paper: “Comprendre l’entrepreneuriat social à Kinshasa : biais cognitifs et relecture conceptuelle”**

**Submitted: 13 April 2026**

**Accepted: 26 May 2026**

**Published: 31 May 2026**

Corresponding Author: Gylord Kakenza Kitumba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n13p126

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Imad Ait Lhassan  
Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Diakite Mory  
Central Queensland University, Australia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: 22 April 2026   | Date Review Report Submitted: 27 April 2026 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Comprendre l'entrepreneuriat social en contexte urbain africain : biais cognitifs, lacunes conceptuelles et relecture théorique à partir de Kinshasa</b> |   |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>   |  |
| The title fits correctly with the abstract of the study.   |  |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>  | <b>4</b>                                       |
| The abstract gives a clear idea about the purpose of the study, the means used to analyze the context of Kinshasa, and also a short idea about the added value of this work. Unfortunately, we do not see anything about the results obtained from this study (does the Kinshasa context have any particularities?). |  |
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>4</b>                                       |
| Yes, there are many grammatical errors to revise.  |  |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>2</b>                                       |
| No, the author shifts from the introduction to the method without giving anything about the context, and a short literature review of the main concepts used in his study. Another point: the  |  |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| author talks about the Kinshasa context without giving any indicator or numbers describing the realities targeted by this study. At the end, I prefer that the author talk about collective innovation and entrepreneurial orientation concepts instead of contextual innovation concept. |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>2</b> |
| The results are not clear. The author must respect the scientific rigor of any academic work. The author talks about explanatory analysis without giving any details.   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>2</b> |
| The author talks about a knowledge gap but didn't cite any Kinshasa study or university scientific work that has already tried to explore social entrepreneurship in Kinshasa   |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>2</b> |
| It lacks African scientific references from third-world or underdeveloped economies (nigeria, algeria, tunesia, morocco...) scientific studies that help to appropriately understand the Kinshasa context.  |          |

**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):**

Make a review of scientific literature related to the same purpose of study in the context of African or underdeveloped countries.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: <b>22-04-2026</b>   | Date Review Report Submitted: <b>30-04-2026</b> |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Comprendre l'entrepreneuriat social en contexte urbain africain : biais cognitifs, lacunes conceptuelles et relecture théorique à partir de Kinshasa</b> |   |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0469/26</b>   |   |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>NO</b>   |   |
| 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: <b>YES</b>   |   |

#### 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>  | <b>4</b>                                       |
| <i>Sujet pertinent et original, avec un fort potentiel théorique, mais le titre gagnerait à être légèrement simplifié pour plus de clarté et d'impact.</i>  |  |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>   | <b>5</b>                                       |
| <i>Le résumé est clair, bien structuré et cohérent, présentant les objectifs, la méthode (approche conceptuelle) et les principaux résultats.</i>   |  |
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>5</b>                                       |
| <i>L'article présente une excellente qualité linguistique, avec une grammaire et une orthographe maîtrisées tout au long du texte. La rédaction est claire, fluide et conforme aux standards académiques, garantissant une très bonne lisibilité et un niveau de professionnalisme élevé.</i> |  |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>5</b>                                       |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <i>La méthode est clairement expliquée et cohérente avec l'objectif de l'étude. Le choix d'une approche conceptuelle et théorique est bien justifié et appuyé par des références pertinentes.</i>   |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Les résultats sont clairs et bien structurés, avec une progression logique des idées.</i>  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>La conclusion est globalement pertinente, cohérente et bien alignée avec le contenu de l'article. Elle met clairement en évidence les principaux apports, notamment la contextualisation de l'entrepreneuriat social à Kinshasa et le rôle de l'université comme levier de transformation. Toutefois, elle reste assez conceptuelle et gagnerait en rigueur académique en intégrant un rappel synthétique des résultats empiriques, ainsi que les limites de la recherche et des perspectives futures.</i> |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <i>Les références sont globalement complètes, pertinentes et bien structurées, et les auteurs ont correctement respecté le format APA. L'organisation est claire et cohérente, ce qui facilite la vérification des sources.</i>   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: DIAKITE Mory  |  |
| University, Country: Central Queensland University, Australia  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 24 April 2026  | Date Review Report Submitted: 5 May 2026 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Comprendre l'entrepreneuriat social en contexte urbain africain: biais cognitifs, lacunes conceptuelles et relecture théorique à partir de Kinshasa</b> |  |
| 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: 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b><br><i>((Title matches the content))</i>   | 4  |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b><br><i>(Methods, theory and results missing in the abstract)</i>  | 3  |
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b><br><i>(Well written)</i>   | 5  |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b><br><i>(Methods explained in the text and not the abstract)</i>  | 4  |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b><br><i>(The results are more theoretical than empirical. The text does not refer to any data collected from the field. This is the big gap in this paper.)</i> | 2  |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>                      | <b>2</b> |
| <i>(The conclusions depend on the different types of data collected. Empirical data are missing)</i> |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>(The scientific works mentioned match the topic)</i>  |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**