Paper: **"L'analyse des variables explicatives de l'adoption du Social CRM par les PME de Tourisme au Maroc : Résultats d'une étude exploratoire"**

Corresponding Author: Mariam Bakkali Bouarrakia

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Nadia Mansour
University of Sousse-Tunisia and University of Salamanca, Spain

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: nadiamansour	Email:
University/Country: university of sousse-tunisia and university of Salamanca-spain	

Date Manuscript Received:6/10/202	Date Review Report Submitted: 7/10/2020
Manuscript Title: L'analyse des variables explicatives de l'adoption du Social CRM par les PME de Tourisme au Maroc : Résultatsd'uneétudeexploratoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55-10-2020	
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**
Yes, the title is very clear	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3.5**
The summary presented the objective and methodology but no indication of the results. *The summary needs to be revised.*	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
yes, it is necessary to revise the text and even for the English abstract	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3.5**
The methodology is clear but the interview guide must be included in the annexes. It is also better to enlarge the sample	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
Yes, the body of the paper is clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2.5**
The conclusion should be enriched by bibliographical references and should give a clear idea of the results. The limits of the work should also be mentioned. And the results should be generalized concerning the international framework.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2.5**
The references are very outdated although the subject is topical. It is necessary to add recent references from 2019 and 2020	

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):

The summary must be rewritten to correct spelling and grammar errors. It is necessary to add more recent references especially at the level of discussion of the results and the conclusion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is interesting and topical but requires a minor revision before publication.