

Manuscript: "The Role of Quality Management in Improving Competitiveness and Performance of Moroccan Organizations"

Submitted: 19 August 2020 Accepted: 13 October 2020 Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Soumaya Outellou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p263

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Achibane Mustapha

ENCG, Maroc

Reviewer 3: Pierluigi Passaro University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

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: ACHIBANE MUSTAPHA				
University/Country: ENCG MAROC				
Date Manuscript Received:13/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/09/2020			
Manuscript Title: The role of quality management in improving competitvenss and performance of Moroccan Organizations				
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0913/20				
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
(Please insert your comments) The title is not compatible with the <i>text</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

4
4
3
3
3

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):

REVIEW THE CONTENT OF THE ARTICLE WITH THE TITLE

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: PIERLUIGI PASSARO		
University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF BARI ALDO MORO		
Date Manuscript Received: 22.09.20	Date Review Report Submitted:	
Manuscript Title: The role of quality management in improving competitiveness and performance of Moroccan Organizations		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0913/20		
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.

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	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
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

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Current work, well done with adequate methodology

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: