

Manuscript: **“Trends in the Collaboration Pattern of Moroccan Research in Earth Sciences from 1984 to 2019: A Case Study”**

Submitted: 11 February 2021

Accepted: 19 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Fida Medina

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p183

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Nirmal Kumar Betchoo, Université Des Mascareignes, Mauritius

Reviewer 2: Dr. Sigit Triyono, Indonesia

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 Nirmal Kumar BETCHOO	
University/Country: Université des Mascareignes, MAURITIUS	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/02/2021
Manuscript Title: Trends In The Collaboration Pattern Of Moroccan Research In Earth Sciences From 1984 To 2014: A Case Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 87.02.21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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> A good title as it evaluates a trend lasting some 30 years.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract is good but a conclusion is needed as it sums up the key findings.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Very well written in good English although Morocco is essentially French-based.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good use of charts, graphics and explanations related to them.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results are clear and consistent.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Reviewer has appended a summary to make it look more concrete and synthesise the results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good references.	

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):

A good paper but just the span is limited up to 2014. Could stretch to 2019 but evidently figures and data must be available. Could prospect that through internalization of research, collaborations with former colony France are less evident as other nations collaborate. One missing point could be collaboration with sub-Saharan Africa where no evidence is given but the potential exists. Keep up with the good work.

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. Sigit Triyono	
University/Country: Indonesia	
Date Manuscript Received: March.15.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: March.17.2021
Manuscript Title: Trends In The Collaboration Pattern Of Moroccan Research In Earth Sciences From 1984 To 2019: A Case Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0287/21	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
-	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
-	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
-	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
-	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Need more update references for building the newest/novelty.</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):

(1) It will be more comprehensive and up date if the references are up to 2019.