

Paper: “Evaluation des Effets des Accords Euro-Mediterraneens sur les Echanges Commerciaux Marocains: Enseignements d’un Modele de Gravite”

Submitted: 05 April 2021

Accepted: 30 October 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Zineb Mikdam

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n38p102](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n38p102)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nadia Mansour
University of Sousse, Tunisia

Reviewer 2: Moloba Lukombo Yannick
University of Kinshasa, Congo

Reviewer 3: Patience Mpanzu Balomba
University of Kinshasa, Congo

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

oui, résumé est bien présenté

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

oui, il fut réviser certaines fautes
d'orthographe et de grammaire

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

La méthode est claire mais il faut enrichir la revue empirique par des références récentes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

oui, c'est bien présenté

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

oui, la conclusion est bien structurée

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

les références sont très mal présentées , il faut réviser cette partie

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il faut aussi ajouter des références bibliographiques au niveau de l'introduction

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title seems clear to me and matches the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is clear. the objects and methods are clear and well presented. On the other hand, the author should add a few more elements of results.

In the last sentence of the abstract, the author mentions "... that other factors, namely the distance, the exchange rate and the existence of a common language influence in a negligible way the exchanges commercial activities of Morocco in the Euro-Mediterranean area ". It will be important for the author to specify in which sense this influence was expected.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. However, I recommend the author to do a final grammar and spelling review because there are a few.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology is sufficiently clear. I noted in particular the examples of the use of the same methodology by other authors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the text is clear but I believe that it is possible to reduce the volume of the body of the text.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

in the conclusion, the author mentions the following: "The free trade agreements signed by Morocco with the various Mediterranean countries certainly allow a gradual reduction in customs duties and improve the conditions of access of national products on foreign markets. ... " So how does the author explain the deterioration of Morocco's trade balance? I believe this should be explained further in the article.

Still in the conclusion, the competition between the Arab countries of the Mediterranean zone relates to what? The document does not really specify what this competition is about.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The bibliography does not seem very rich to me, just 7 references on the list of bibliographic references. The bibliography does not specify the number of pages of the works consulted nor the pages consulted.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The article also lacks a discussion section in which a comparison should have been made between the author's results and those of other authors who have used the same methodology before.
- The author can try to minimize repetition, which will reduce the number of pages in the article. To go straight to the point.
- the list of bibliographical references should be enriched.
- The manuscript also lacks a discussion section in which a comparison should have been made between the author's results and those of other authors who have used the same methodology before.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. Perspective (recommandation) should be added in abstract, if possible.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Wery w ell explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Paper body is well written, but its size must be reduced, because of there are many pages. I suggested some points that should be reduced or deleted.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Perspective (recommandation) must be added, if possible.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

References list is poor, but must be improved by adding them in paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author should reduce pages number by reducing size. Congratulation, paper is well written

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: