



Paper: “De la théorie de l’émission dans une vente à distance par correspondance classique à la théorie de la réception dans une vente à distance électronique”

Corresponding Author: Hicham Rahal

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p433

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mialoundama Bakouetila Gilles Freddy
Université Marien Ngouabi, Congo

Reviewer 2: Pony Lucas
Universite de Dschang, Cameroun

Published: 31.07.2020

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: Dr PONY LUCAS	Email:
University/Country: CAMEROUN/ UNIVERSITE DE DSCHANG	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/05/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/6/20
Manuscript Title: De la théorie de l'émission dans une vente à distance par correspondance classique à la théorie de la reception dans une vente à distance électronique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0619/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No 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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LE TITRE EST TROP LONG ET PRÊTE A CONFUSION PAR RAPPORT AU PLAN ET AU CONTENU	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
LE RESUME ANNONCE LE PLAN OR ON S'ATTENDAIT A LA METHODE ET RESULTATS ATTENDUS	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
REVOIR LE TEXTE INTEGRALEMENT POUR LES FAUTES	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
ABSENCE DES STATISTIQUES POUR SOUTENIR LES ARGUMENTS	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)ENTRE EXPEDITEUR ET DESTINATAIRES PAS D'ASSURANCE AUX VIRUS, TAMPON DE LA POSTE PEUT ÊTRE CORRUMPU</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)PAS DE PROPOSITION ALORS QUE LA COFACE=COMPAGNIE FRANCAISE ASSURANCE AU COMMERCE EXTERIEUR FAIT FIGURE D'ASSURANCE RISQUE VIRUS ET RISQUE VENDEUR</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments) RESPECTER L'ORDRE ALPHABETIQUE ET CHRONOLOGIQUE</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):

REVOIR LA METHODE, LE PLAN, LES RESULTATS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

CLASSER VOS EVALUATEURS PAR SPECIALITES ET DISCIPLINE