



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “L’Afrique et la démocratie, une opportunité mal négociée”

Submitted: 20 April 2026

Accepted: 01 September 2026

Published: 30 September 2026

Corresponding Author: Joachim Adjagbessi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n26p107

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: William Hermann Arrey
Protestant University of Central Africa, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Prime Niyongabo
University of Burundi, Burundi

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Prime NIYONGABO	
University, Country: University of Burundi, Burundi	
Date Manuscript Received: May, 8 th	Date Review Report Submitted: May, 10 th
Manuscript Title: L'AFRIQUE ET LA DÉMOCRATIE, UNE OPPORTUNITÉ MAL NÉGOCIÉE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: I agree	
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: I approve	

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 for the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Even the title is clear, it is necessary to stay focusing on the main research question during the whole article: Même si le titre est claire, il est nécessaire de rester sur la question principale de recherche dans tout l'article	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract doesn't mention clearly the objectives and the methods: le résumé ne mentionne pas clairement les objectifs de la recherche et la méthodologie utilisée	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is better to read carefully the whole article in order to correct somme grammatical errors: c'est bon de lire attentivement tout l'article en vue de corriger certaines erreurs de grammaire	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is necessary to improve this part by consulting some documents related to this methods used in this article.: Il est nécessaire d'améliorer cette partie en consultant certains documents liés aux methods de recherche employees dans cet article	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are clear but there is a need to improve them according to the research questions: les résultats sont claires mais il est nécessaire de les améliorer conformément aux questions de recherche	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content but it is better to improve them by focusing on the research questions. It is also necessary to restructure the article because a good structure shows the plan well numbered for example: introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion. The parts can be balanced; les conclusions sont précises et se rapportent au contenu mais il y a moyen de les améliorer. Il est nécessaire de restructurer l'article car une bonne structure montre le plan bien	

numéroté comme par exemple: Introduction, méthodes ou methodology, Résultats, discussion et conclusion. Les parties peuvent être équilibrées	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is a need to improve the references (in all parties and at the end on the list of references): il y a besoin d'améliorer les références: tout au long du contenu et à la fin sur la liste des références	

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):

I appreciate the relevance of the topic and how it is developed but I realize that it is necessary to improve the article by reading and making own my humble observations: J'apprécie la pertinence du sujet de recherche et la façon dont il a été développé mais je constate qu'il est nécessaire d'améliorer cet article en s'appropriant de mes humbles observations

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Prof. William Hermann ARREY	
University, Country: Protestant University of Central Africa, Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 11 May 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 May 2026
Manuscript Title: <i>L'AFRIQUE ET LA DÉMOCRATIE, UNE OPPORTUNITÉ MAL NÉGOCIÉE</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0510/26	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	3.5
<i>Le titre est accrocheur, toutefois, il doit être plus précis sur le cas étudié car l'auteur n'a pas fait le tour des pays africains à partir d'un échantillonnage conséquent.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>La méthode utilisée n'est pas clairement énoncée dans le résumé tant pour la collecte que l'analyse des données.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Très rare, le niveau de langue est adapté.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2.5
<i>Oui au niveau de la méthodologie, il énonce ses outils qui nous paraissent très pauvres. Axée sur la recherche documentaire, l'auteur n'a lu que onze articles et ouvrages sur la panoplie de fond documentaire disponible sur la démocratie.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>L'analyse est pertinente mais pas démontrée</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Oui, la conclusion est fidèle au contenu.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Références minimalistes, il faut enrichir par la lecture d'ouvrages pertinents sur la démocratie, le développement et les droits et libertés. Il n'a lu que 11 articles et livres.</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):

Article très intéressant mais besoin d'une démonstration pour être scientifiquement acceptable.