

Paper: “L’analyse Qualitative Inorganique Dans le Curriculum Formel Marocain et Chez Les Futurs Enseignants de Physique-Chimie en Cycle Secondaire Collégial”

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Bouabdallah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p188

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tantely Andriamampianina University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Momar Ndiaye, Cheikh Anta DIOP – Dakar - Sénégal

Reviewer 3: Maman Moustapha Rabiou, Université Abdou Moumouni

Published: 30.06.2020

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 ANDRIAMAMPIANINA Tianarilalaina Tantely	
University/Country: University of Antananarivo / Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/04/2020
Manuscript Title: L'analyse Qualitative Inorganique Dans le Curriculum Formel Marocain et Chez Les Futurs Enseignants de Physique-Chimie en Cycle Secondaire Collégial Inorganic Qualitative Analysis in the Moroccan Formal Curriculum and for the Future Physics-Chemistry Teachers in Secondary College Cycle.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857 - 7881	
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.	5
<i>The title appropriately reflects the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>The abstract gives a good summary of the introduction, the objectives, the methodology and the results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Few grammar errors were found in the article and other sentences express repetitive idea.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology is clear and concise.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The content of the article is clear but length of the chapters is not balanced: chapters II and IV, for instance, are longer than others. Some sentences are too long, making them hard to understand.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion appropriately summarize the content of the article</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are appropriate. However, there are few missing page numbers, punctuation and quoting of the name of two authors in the article.</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):

I would suggest to:

- *Remove the page numbering on the references quoted in the article.*
- *Change the long and complex sentence into simple and clear sentence.*
- *Shorten the chapter II if possible.*
- *Shorten the conclusion.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is a bit too long.

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: Momar NDIAYE	
University/Country: Cheikh Anta DIOP – Dakar - Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/04/2020
Manuscript Title: Inorganic Qualitative Analysis in the Moroccan Formal Curriculum and for the Future Physics-Chemistry Teachers in Secondary College Cycle.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0430/20	
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.

<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	2

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments): le résumé est à revoir, surtout la phrase soulignée en jaune.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments): les paragraphes soulignés en jaune doivent être revus.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments): il faut corriger les paragraphes soulignés. Le texte doit être revu.</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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments): Il faut diminuer les références</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):

Il faut corriger les fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire. Les paragraphes soulignés en jaune doivent être reformulés ou enlevés pour une meilleure compréhension du texte.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'article peut être accepté à condition de faire les corrections soulignées.