

Paper: “Vendre le Doute: Des Outils de Communication au Service de la Manipulation des Masses”

Submitted: 02 June 2023

Accepted: 04 July 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Gilles Paché

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p86](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p86)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benoit Kouakou
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Karima Laamiri
Université Abdelmalek Essaïdi, Moaroc

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: KOUAKOU Oi Kouakou Benoît	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/06/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/06/2023
Vendre le doute : des outils de communication au service de la manipulation des masses	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0634/23	
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>(Le titre est clair et original.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Il s'agit ici d'une étude purement réflexive, et le résumé présente bien l'objet et la substance du résultat de la réflexion.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(L'article est très bien écrit et nous n'y avons détecté aucune faute d'orthographe ni de grammaire, sinon une phrase à reformuler pour en faciliter la compréhension ainsi qu'un mot à changer.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(L'auteur propose « une exploration des mécanismes utilisés par les marchands de doute... ». Mais la méthode pratique d'exploration et d'analyse n'est pas clairement exposée.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(La réflexion menée aboutit à des résultats très fournis, pertinents et heuristiques.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(La conclusion résume bien le travail mené. De plus, elle propose des perspectives pour des recherches futures.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Les références sont appropriées et actuelles pour la plupart.)</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 travail est original, bien construit et très agréable à lire. Le sujet abordé est digne d'intérêt, et la réflexion menée répond aux attentes du lecteur. De très légères corrections sont certainement nécessaires aux pages 2 et 6 (voir commentaire).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Karima LAAMIRI	
University/Country: Université Abdelmalek Essaïdi, Moaroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 07 juin	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 juin
Manuscript Title: Vendre le doute : des outils de communication au service de la manipulation des masses	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0634/23	
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>Le titre est assez représentant du contenu</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé reste un peu vague. Il faut plus de précision des méthodes et des résultats</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Il y a des initiales qu'il faut expliciter.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
C'est assez clair.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Oui.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Oui.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Il est préférable de mettre des notes de page.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: