



Paper: “Learner-Centered Teaching: A Case Study of its Implementation in Physics and Chemistry Classes in Moroccan High Schools”

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Merouane El Hammoumi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p271

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amaya Epelde Larranaga
University of Granada, Spain

Reviewer 2: Kiluba L. Nkulu
University of Kentucky, USA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

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. Amaya Epelde	
University/Country: University of Granada - Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Learner-Centered teaching. Its implementation in Moroccan High Schools. Physics and Chemistry classes as a case study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0840/20	
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 is correct.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract does not present the methodology, the results and the conclusions</i>	

<i>obtained. The author must make a synthesis of all these sections.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are some grammatical errors. See attached document.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>It is necessary to explain the instrument, its validity and reliability. It is also necessary to explain how the questionnaire was applied to the teachers and the steps that were taken before completing it by teachers. It is also necessary to write how the data analysis was carried out, what software was used.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>It is necessary not to repeat in text what is clearly expressed in the graphics.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>In the conclusions there are phrases that repeat what is written in the results. This should be avoided. The conclusions are interesting and reflect the reality of Morocco, but are not linked to other research. The conclusions should be compared with conclusions of other existing research on the subject.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Most of the references are very old. The sources must be dated within the last 10 years (see the attached document). Check APA citation style.</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):

See attached document.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 07/31/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Learner-Centered Teaching: Its implementation In Moroccan High Schools Physics and Chemistry Classes as a Case Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0840/20	
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: 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.	4
The title is clear enough but could be strengthened a little more by revising the second part to plainly make it a case study of physics and chemistry classes in Moroccan high schools.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract does not clearly present results, except for the mentioning of shortcomings in teaching practices and a set of recommendations without naming them.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes, there are errors to be corrected (pages 2,4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 17)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
No comment.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Only minor errors.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
No comment.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
References are comprehensive, except for lacking documentation of an in-text reference to Williams & Burden, 1977:30 on page 2.	

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):

Editorial revisions are needed to address errors and comments made for questions 1, 2, 3, and 7.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: