

Paper: “Contribution de l'Intelligence Artificielle à la Performance des Projets de Recherche Scientifique”

Submitted: 18 November 2024

Accepted: 11 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Abdellah Boukind

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p190](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p190)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohammed Abid

Regional Center for Education and Training, Rabat-Salé-Kénitra, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Benbrahim Mohamed

Centre Régional des Métiers de l'Éducation et de la Formation de la Région Sous-Massa (CRMEF-SM), Maroc

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Suggest this title

Artificial intelligence's role in carrying out scientific research initiatives

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Acceptable, subject to some revisions.

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

there are some grammatical mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No, it is better to see her again

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Please refer to the manuscript submission guide. Number the paragraphs.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

(The conclusion must be reviewed)

(Reminder: the conclusion of a research article must summarize, enhance, and open perspectives. It ensures that the reader understands the essential contributions of the study, its limitations, and its future potential, while linking the results to theoretical or practical implications.)

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The contribution of artificial intelligence to the performance of Phd student's scientific research projects

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

-replace impact with effect.

- the content analysis method used in the course of this work should be mentioned.

- Add the main results

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

Nothing to report

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method section needs to be expanded:

- Give the sample size

- Describe the individuals in the sample (experience, speciality, number of years preparing the research project, etc.)

- Describe the interview guide

-Describe the interview process (with or without recording)

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

- A number of previous results have been mentioned in the introduction without bibliographical references.

- Figures 4 and 7 are of poor quality; I recommend improving or reshaping them.

- I invite the authors to enhance the discussion by comparing their results with previously published findings (to be cited)

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Needs improvement: I notice that the conclusion is longer than the discussion

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

some references cited in the text do not appear in the list of references, while other references appear in the list but not in the text.

the citation of some references does not respect the standards

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I invite the authors to address the corrections mentioned above as well as the additional ones

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Il faut ajouter un titre en langue française puisque l'article est en français.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé ne comprend pas les résultats de ce travail

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

Voir quelques remarques dans le texte de l'article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie de ce travail est claire mais nécessite plus de précision sur :

- Le nombre des échantillons utilisés dans cette étude (doctorants chercheurs)

- Mettre ce paragraphe "définition de la recherche" avant le paragraphe "la recherche

scientifique”.

- Il faut ajouter quelques lignes sur le logiciel Nvivo 10

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

- Il faut bien analyser la figure 6 en montrant la signification des nombres (0, 1, 2...), en montrant l’impact de l’IA sur la performance

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Rien à signaler

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Voir quelques remarques dans le texte de l’article

- 35 références n’existent pas dans le texte (couleur jaune)

- (Nilsson, 2010) ou 2014

- (Cavanagh.S, 1997), n’existe pas parmi les références

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Voir les remarques sur l’article.
