

**Paper: “L’Utilisation des TIC Favorise-t-Elle l’Innovation ? Le Cas des Entreprises Industrielles Marocaines”**

**Submitted: 03 September 2023**

**Accepted: 25 October 2023**

**Published: 31 October 2023**

Corresponding Author: Samira Oukarfi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p180](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n28p180)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Olga Mbang  
University of Yaoundé 2 Soa, IRIC

Reviewer 3: Abdoulaye Maiga  
FSEG, Mali

# 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: Dr Abdoulaye Maïga	
University/Country: FSEG/Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/10	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/10
Manuscript Title: <b>L'utilisation des TIC favorise-t-elle l'innovation ? Le cas des entreprises industrielles marocaines</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---26.---31.09.2023---	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>estimation method missing</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>Yes</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I was pleased to examine this document. Such a rich and well-written article, which made me want to read more. I came across just a few minor observations in this article.

**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!*

<b>Reviewer Name:</b> Olga Marthe Mbang	
<b>University/Country:</b> University of Yaoundé 2 Soa/ IRIC	
<b>Date Manuscript Received:</b> 09/10/2023	<b>Date Review Report Submitted:</b> 21/10/2023
<b>Manuscript Title:</b> L'utilisation des TIC favorise-t-elle l'innovation ? Le cas des entreprises industrielles marocaines	
<b>ESJ Manuscript Number:</b> 0931/23	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Le thème est clair et explicite.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Le modèle et la technique d'analyse ne sont pas clairement présentés dans le résumé.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Quelques erreurs de grammaires et orthographes à corriger.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Pour la variable intensité de la concurrence, en deça de quel seuil est ce qu'on peut affirmer qu'il y a « peu d'entreprises » ? « beaucoup d'entreprises » correspond à quel seuil par exemple ? Quelles sont les bornes entre lesquelles on peut estimer que l'intensité de la concurrence est moyenne ?</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>If faut tester la robustesse du modèle d'analyse. L'auteur aurait pu introduire les variables explicatives progressivement. Par exemple commencer par les variables d'intérêt sans variables de conditionnement et voir comment se comportent les résultats et ainsi de suite...</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>On ne sait pas ce que deviennent les hypothèses de l'étude.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Refaire la bibliographie en se référant à la norme APA la plus récente.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>1</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- Relire l'article et évaluer la robustesse du modèle d'analyse.
- Enlever toutes les parties peintes en jaune- Rouge dans le texte ; c'est-à-dire : des **Remerciements** à la **Déclaration de financement**. Lesdits éléments n'ont pas de place dans un article.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

