

Paper: “Gestion de l’environnement dans les villes industrielles : faillite de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises ou absence de contrôle des communes ? L’exemple de Douala au Cameroun”

Submitted: 12 October 2023

Accepted: 02 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Nokam Motio Nina Gaëlle

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p296

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kasimou Tihami
Université Norbert Zongo, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: TIAMIYU Kasimou	
University/Country: Université Norbert ZONGO/ BURKINA FASO	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/03/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/03/2024
Manuscript Title: Gestion de l'environnement dans les villes industrielles: faillite de la responsabilité sociale des entreprises ou absence de contrôle des communes? L'exemple de Douala au Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1052/23	
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.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>Voir le manuscrit</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>La technique d'échantillonnage n'est pas élucidée, le traitement et l'analyse des données ne sont pas expliqués, la zone d'étude n'est pas explicitement présentée</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Ils sont plus ou moins claires. Cependant, les auteurs ne vont pas à l'essentiel si bien la lecture devient lassante. Certaines parties de la rubrique traitement et analyse des données s'y retrouvent.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les références sont anciennes. Plus de 60% datent de plus de 10 ans</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):

Les auteurs doivent se conformer au canévas de la revue pour une meilleurs presentation de leur manuscrit. Des observations complémentaires sont faites dans le corps du manuscrit. Invite est donc faite de les prendre en compte.