

Paper: “Étude qualitative de la relation entre les Pratiques de Management du Capital Humain et l’Engagement Organisationnel : cas des Professionnels de la Santé Publique”

Submitted: 21 February 2022

Accepted: 04 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Houda El Ammary

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n23p63](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n23p63)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Toure Drissa

Université Félix Houphouët Boigny d'Abidjan (RCI)

Reviewer 2: Mohammed Kerbouche

University of Mascara, Algeria

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received:07/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/06/2022
Manuscript Title: Etude qualitative de la relation entre les Pratiques de Management du Capital Humain l'Engagement Organisationnel : cas des Professionnels de la Santé Publique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0311/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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.

<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>	

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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 04-03-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 12-03-2022
Manuscript Title: Etude qualitative de la relation entre les Pratiques de Management du Capital Humain et l'Engagement Organisationnel : cas des Professionnels de la Santé Publique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0311/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.

<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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<i>Le titre correspond au contenu de l'article mais il est long. On aurait pu dire: Pratiques de Management du Capital Humain et Engagement Organisationnel : cas des Professionnels de la Santé Publique</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) Le résumé ressemble plus à une partie introductive surtout avec l'usage du futur.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Certaines parties présentent nombre d'erreurs de grammaire qu'il est nécessaire de corriger.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) La méthodologie est bien expliquée et adaptée.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Les résultats sont clairement présentés et compréhensibles.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) La conclusion présente quelques parties non soutenues par le contenu de l'article. Elle doit aussi être renforcée.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le résumé doit être revu pour présenter le travail qui a été fait (objectif-méthode-résultats). L'utilisation du temps futur donne l'impression qu'il s'agit d'une introduction. La conclusion aussi doit être revue pour être étoffée. Les recommandations faites dans la conclusion doivent être cohérentes avec l'ensemble du développement.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: