

Paper: **“Impact de la Communication de Crise Sur la Réputation de l'Entreprise
- Cas des Réseaux Sociaux Boycott au Maroc”**

Submitted: 27 December 2022

Accepted: 27 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Yaser Mounir

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p254](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n16p254)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Massar Sene

Universite Gaston Berger De Saint-Louis, Senegal

Reviewer 2: Maïga Abdoulaye

Université de Bamako, Bamako Mali

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: Dr MASSAR SENE	
University/Country: Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis- Institut Supérieur deManagement DAKAR IDA	
Date Manuscript Received: 28 Mars 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 04-04-2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of crisis communication on the company's reputation - social networks case Boycott in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	

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.	4/5
<i>La version française du titre est introuvable. Mais la traduction permet de voir qu'il est clair, explicite, comporte des mots-clés et porte sur un cas bien précis.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5/5
<p><i>Le résumé comporte beaucoup de fautes de syntaxe. L'écriture scientifique n'est maîtrisée.</i></p> <p><i>Les objectifs ne sont pas bien écrits. A leur place, les auteurs ont posé des questions de recherche.</i></p> <p><i>Les techniques d'échantillonnage ne sont pas clairement expliquées</i></p> <p><i>-Les résultats de l'étude ne sont pas esquissés.</i></p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1.5/5
<p><i>Le texte présente beaucoup de fautes de syntaxe, de grammaire et de conjugaison. Le niveau d'expression laisse vraiment à désirer. Un grand toilettage de l'expression s'impose avant toute proposition de publication. On a comme l'impression que les auteurs n'ont pas relu leur travail.</i></p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5/5
<p><i>Les objectifs ne sont pas clairement déclinés, les candidats ne maîtrisent pas la méthode pour prendre en charge un objectif général et des objectifs spécifiques.</i></p> <p><i>L'échantillonnage est bien expliqué mais n'est pas logé au bon endroit.</i></p> <p><i>Tout ce qui relève d'enquêtes, d'échantillons doit figurer dans la partie "Matériels et méthodes". Les hypothèses sont inutiles et à supprimer si on se réfère aux norms d'ESJ.</i></p> <p><i>La présentation d'un tableau de l'échantillonnage est appréciable.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4/5
<p><i>Les résultats proviennent effectivement d'une étude scientifique hypothético-déductive. Les données proviennent de l'échantillonnage annoncé.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2.5/5
<p><i>La synthèse est relativement correcte avec des aspérités à enlever tout de même. Les recommandations constituent la grande faiblesse de cette conclusion.</i></p> <p><i>De plus le sujet d'étude n'est pas élargi par un changement de thème.</i></p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2.5/5

Si le nombre de références est assez satisfaisant, tel n'est pas le cas de la forme. Les candidats ne maîtrisent pas la méthode de référencement. Parfois les initiales des noms sont citées parfois les noms complets; l'emplacement des années de publication pose problème.

Je suggère aux auteurs de revoir les ouvrages de méthodologie pour savoir comment citer une référence bibliographique.

TOTAL NOTE: 21.5/35

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):

-Problèmes d'écriture majeurs perceptibles à travers tout l'article: syntaxe, grammaire et conjugaison.

-Résumé à compléter par les objectifs et les résultats de l'étude

-Titre à mettre aussi en français et commencer le résumé par la version française.

-Objectifs de l'étude non clairement déclinés

-Des transferts et des restructurations s'imposant dans la partie méthodologique.

-Résultats recevables.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Maïga Abdoulaye	
University/Country: Faculty of Economics and Management (FSEG)	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of crisis communication on the company's reputation - social networks case Boycott in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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>A well constructed and topical theme</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Given the presentation and quality of the work, we note that the authors did not provide a good part of the results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>This document has been written with great care and has fewer mistakes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The methods are clear, but the authors need to review the structure of the research methodology developed.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>The results were not discussed by the authors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusion is clear and answers the hypothesis</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Several authors cited in the document do not appear in the bibliographic reference</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors have put in a lot of effort, but should take these few recommendations to improve the quality of your document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/03/2023
Manuscript Title: Impact of crisis communication on the company's reputation - social networks case Boycott in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: paper for review 0118/23	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your commenTs)</i> <i>Titre est claire</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Pas très claire	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Il y a des incompréhensions et une réorganisation à refaire	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<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 type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les auteurs doivent revoir les différentes articulations afin d'améliorer cet article. Au niveau des mots clés, il est préférable de mentionner au max 05 mots. La problématique, la méthodologie et les résultats sont à revoir. Les tests d'hypothèse de chi-deux à revoir. Les paragraphes sont assez explicatives, une synthèse s'impose. Les références bibliographiques doivent être uniforme. Bien vouloir lancer un coup d'oeil sur le canevas des articles scientifiques.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: