Paper: **"Teachers' Perception of the Moroccan ICT Portal of the Ministry of Education"**

Corresponding Author: Youssra El Janous

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Anita Mandarić Vukušić
University of Split, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Khalid Mahdi
Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale: Tétouan, MA

Reviewer 3: Monia EL Barbari
Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, UAE

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is adequate and corresponds to the content of the articles.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly explains the objectives, methods and results.

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

I am not qualified enough to comment on grammatical errors and article style.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods were clearly presented and the research was conducted on a large sample of respondents.

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

The body of the paper is clear, however methodologically speaking, only the arithmetic mean was used to present the results. I consider this a shortcoming of research.

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

The conclusion is correct and supports the content. I think that the limitations of the research should also be mentioned.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The literature is appropriate, but I think there are too few references. I suggest adding more references to the text.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Expand the literature and write in conclusion the limitations of the research.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is clear but it does not fit to the presentation and analysis of results. There should be a clear connection between those two parts. The title should contain the part about digital education"...school failure and digital education"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is focused on main points of the research, but it does not contain the part about researching the quality of digital education.

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

Just a few ("reserch" - it should be "research")

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained but there should be more precisely explaint the process of colecting data (e.g. was the research conucted face-to-face method, or on-line, during what period), there is noted that the authors"will try to determine the validity of the hypotheses", but the hypothesis are not quoted in the research.

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

The body of the paper is clear, without errors.

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

The Conclusion contain more conclusions that are not directly connetcted with theory background or results. The Conclusion should contain only conclusions that are brought by this research only.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of refereces is appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a very good work. The authors show knowledge of the topic, and sensitivity to the contemporary issues of educational process. In order to improve the paper, it is necessary to even more precisely link the title, summary, and analysis of the results, and in the conclusion state only those conclusions that are resulted from the analysis of this research. It would be better to explain in the theoretical background, the importance of the quality of digital education in school success. In this way, the bibliography will be enriched.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

It's simple and clear, But it's not suitable to the article
First, it should indicat the Moroccan ICT portal of the Ministry of Education
Second, there's no sutudent perception nor the cause of the failers in the article

I suggest this title:
Teachers' perception of the Moroccan ICT portal of the Ministry of Education

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is focused heavily on equality of opportunity and the reduction of school failure and drop-out but the article focus on the ITC
So, it should focus on the quality of the Ministry ICT in education.

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

Just a Few errors
- "and also" it should be "and"
- "reserch" - it should be "research"
- "ICTE" should be "ICT in education"

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The sudy method should indicate :
- The hypotheses
- The way of collection
- The survey completion date and it duration
- The validity of the hypothese
-The Likert scale it's better than Yes/No styled questions

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

The body of the paper is clear, without any errors.

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

No direct connection between the body and the conclusion, it should contain just the result of the servey

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of refereces is appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It a good work but you should improve your paper by correcting the title and the conclusion

----

Reviewer G:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, the title is adequate to the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and well divided between the objects, methods and results.
however, I suggest to change:
"pupils" to "students"
"since he does not understand the question well" to "since he does not quite understand the meaning of the question itself "

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

There aren't too many spelling or grammatical errors, but the punctuation and spaces need to be revised, they seem to be out of place in several sentences.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The METHODS part is well-developed and explained step by step

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

The document just needs a slight revision, some words are repeated several times although this can easily be avoided.

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

The conclusion is good.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I strongly suggest redoing this part.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):