

Paper: “« Les Géomorphosites des Communes Rurales Aglmam Azegza et Oum Rbiaa : Potentialités Naturelles et Culturelles Face aux Contraintes de la Sauvegarde et de l’Intégration Touristique »”

Submitted: 11 March 2019

Accepted: 11 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Boukhald

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n35p124

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zahra Mourabit
Cadi Ayyad, Marrakech, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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:	
University/Country: cadi Ayyad/Marrakech	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/11/2022
Manuscript Title: geomorphosites of rural communes AGLMAM AZEGZA and OUM RABIAA: Natural and cultural potentialities in the face of of the constraints of safeguarding and tourism integration	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>The title is informative and a true reflection of the content</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear and summarize the main goal, results and methodes.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the research methodology is clearly described</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Very clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Some references does not cited in the text.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No comments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is an interesting research topic. Clearly presented and well structured, enough and sufficient data results to arrive into a final conclusion, the analysis and methodology are clear enough, and the manuscript is

*generally well-structured. The manuscript is acceptable **with minor revision.***