

Paper: "Gestion du stress, régulation de la charge cognitive et rendement professionnel des Conseillers d'Orientation des lycées et collèges de Maroua (Cameroun)"

Corresponding Author: Dje Bi Tchan Guillaume

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p90

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Saliha Bouzid Université de Bejaia, Algérie

Reviewer 3: Bawa Ibn Habib Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. *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:	Email:	
University/Country:		
Date Manuscript Received:05/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:10/06/2020	
Manuscript Title: Gestion du stress, régulation de la charge cognitive et rendement professionnel des Conseillers d'Orientation des lycées et collèges de Maroua (Cameroun)		
(Ca	ameroun)	
(Ca ESJ Manuscript Number:	ameroun)	

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.	5
Le titre de l'article et clair et correspond au contenu de l'artic	le
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

Le résumé présente les éléments essetiels qui permettent u lecteur d'avoir une idée claire sur le contenu de l'article

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	3
mistakes in this article.	5

Nous avons relevé quelques fautes d'orthographe qui doivent etre corrigées (nous avons souligné certaines dans le texte). L'auteur devrait relire son texte, corriger les fautes et revoir certaines formulations.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
L'auteur ne donne pas de détails sur les deux outils de sa rech détaillés, nombre de question, procédure des entretiens et que déroulement de l'enquète.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Acceptable	·
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion reprend les éléments essentiels de l'article, obje résultats. L'auteur fait aussi des recommandations.	ectifs, méthodologie ,
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références sont variées et en relation avec le thème. Cepe corriger et unifier l'écriture des références en respectant les n édition)	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Corriger les fautes d'orthographe; Revoir la formulation de certaines parties; Développer plus la partie outils de la recherche; Corriger et unifier la rédaction de la bibliographie.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Une relecture est nécessaire pour corriger les fautes. La thématique est intéressante et a été bien abordée par l'auteur.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. *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: Date Review Report Submitted: 08/06/2020

Manuscript Title: Gestion du stress, régulation de la charge cognitive et rendementprofessionnel des Conseillersd'Orientation des lycées et collèges de Maroua (Cameroun)

ESJ Manuscript Number: 01

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	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
(Please insert your comments)	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

$\label{eq:overall Recommendation} Overall \ Recommendation (mark \ an \ X \ with \ your \ recommendation):$

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le problème de recherchedevraêtreprécisé à partirl'élémentsfactuels (cf. observations dans le manuscrit).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. *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: BAWA Ibn Habib	Email:	
University/Country: Togo		
Date Manuscript Received: 05 juin	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 juin	
Manuscript Title: Gestion du stress, régulation de la charge cognitive et rendementprofessionnel des Conseillersd'Orientation des lycées et collèges de Maroua (Cameroun)		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0663/20		
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No		

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No

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
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
(Please insert your comments)	
Les fautessontcorrigées par endroit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
Il reste à presenter les methods d'analyse des données	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
Relire pour corriger les fautes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Relire le texte pour voir les observations annotées

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: