Paper: **"Le Marketing Politique: L'art de Convaincre les Electeurs Etude de Benchmark entre la France et le Maroc"**

Corresponding Author: Achraf Amara

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Safae Laamrani El Idrissi
Ibn Tofail University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Karima Laamiri
Université Abdelmalek Essaidi, Tétouan, Maroc

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: sara ameur	
University/Country: morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/11/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/11/2023
Manuscript Title: Le Marketing Politique : L'Art de Convaincre les Électeurs Etude de benchmark entre la France et le Maroc	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1126/23	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**

Je propose de mettre tittle en anglaise, et en dessous titre en francais, pour que ca soit plus Claire. *Et mettre tout le titre au niveau de la meme ligne.* *Sinon le titre est tres attractive.*	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
Oui, mais la liste des mots clés est incomplete à mon sens, il faut au minimum ajouter : France, et maroc.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Oui, il y'a des erreurs ; des S qui manquent, quelques accents… mais ce n'est pas grave.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
Oui, c'est une étude de benchmarking, la méthode est assez simple.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
Nous ne pouvons pas dire que les résultats ne contiennent pas des erreurs, puisque c'est une etude benchmarking qualitative, il n'y'a rien de quantitative dans cette étude, donc on juge ici le sens d'analyse et la manière de passer l'information.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
Oui, les references sont interessantes et d'actualité.	

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:

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 17/11/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/11/2023
Manuscript Title: Le Marketing Politique et l'art de convaincre les électeurs : Etude de benchmark entre la France et le Maroc	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1126/23	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
Le titre est explicite et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Le résumé expose de manière concise les objets, les méthodes et les résultats de manière claire.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

Dans votre article, le résumé comporte de nombreuses erreurs orthographiques et grammaticales. Pour le reste, c'est satisfaisant.

Exemple :

- Dans cet article <mark>nous avant</mark> effectué**e** une étude comparative entre les pratiques du Marketing politique au Maroc et en France

- Il ressort de notre analyse que l**a** marketing politique

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
Une partie de la méthodologie semble manquer dans votre article. Je suggère d'inclure une petite section sur la méthodologie de recherche adoptée (étude comparative) avant d'aborder la section sur le marketing politique en France.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont clairs, mais des références manquent. Il est nécessaire de justifier les éléments que vous avez pris en vous appuyant sur des articles ou des rapports.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Les conclusions ou le résumé sont précis et étayés par le contenu.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Les références sont exhaustives, cependant, veuillez-vous conformer aux normes APA.	

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):

Votre article aborde des aspects intéressants. Cependant, il serait bénéfique d'améliorer le résumé, l'introduction ainsi que les références bibliographiques. De plus, l'ajout d'une section dédiée à la méthodologie de recherche est recommandé.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Cet article est un document de recherche original et qui mérite d'être publié dans le journal, après correction.