Paper: **"Diffusion des TIC dans l'Enseignement Secondaire General du District de Yamoussoukro (Cote d'Ivoire): Etat des Lieux et Defis a Relever"**

Corresponding Author: Konan Berenger Yao

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: **AINYAKOU Taiba Germaine**	
University/Country: **Côte d'Ivoire**	
Date Manuscript Received: **07/07/2023**	Date Review Report Submitted: **13/07/2023**
Manuscript Title: **DIFFUSION DES TIC DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT SECONDAIRE GÉNÉRAL DU DISTRICT DE YAMOUSSOUKRO (CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : ÉTAT DES LIEUX ET DÉFIS À RELEVER**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0515/23	
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.	**3**
(The subject is acceptable, it has a social value, a social space and implicitly the category studied.)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
(The abstract clearly presents objects but methods and results must be improve)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(This article note some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
(The study methods are explained clearly. However, it is recommended that the authors mention the "quantitative method" as the method used in this work.)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
(The results are clear however, authors are advised to review a few spelling mistakes)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
(the summary is acceptable, but the conclusion is insufficient. The authors must review the methodology and the main points of the results)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
(Authors must standardise bibliographic references. Some of the titles of your articles are " " and others are not.)	
Example: CLEARY C., AKKARI A. & CORTI D., 2008, L'intégration des TIC dans l'enseignement secondaire, in *Formation et pratiques d'enseignement en questions*, N° 7, pp. 29-49 Mastafi M., 2020, **«** Rôles et impacts des TIC dans l'enseignement et l'apprentissage des mathématiques : perceptions des enseignants du secondaire **»**, in *Formation et profession* [En ligne], N° 28, vol. (2), pp. 60-74, URL : http://dx.doi.org/10.18162/fp.2020.508 (consulté le 1ᵉʳ Janvier 2023)	

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):

it is recommended that the authors revise the research question. Indeed, they made the following point: despite the many advantages of the pedagogical integration of ICTs in education, the Ivorian education sector, in all its diversity, is still struggling to integrate them effectively into the learning process of learners at all levels, especially secondary education.

This presupposes that we perceive

The problem we are suggesting is: what is the problem of disseminating and integrating ICTs in general secondary schools in the city of Yamoussoukro?

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: Dr **Fadwa Rih**	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **DIFFUSION DES TIC DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT SECONDAIRE GÉNÉRAL DU DISTRICT DE YAMOUSSOUKRO (CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : ÉTAT DES LIEUX ET DÉFIS À RELEVER**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0515/23**	
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**
The title is very clear and adequate to the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
The abstract is too long; it contains some elements that can be emerged into the introduction. It could have included a few figures to support the findings relative to the equipment, the use and the quality of connection…	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
They have been corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
-Explain: How did you choose the students surveyed? -I suggest a summary diagram that shows the methodology used in stages during your study	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
-Very clear results but must be supported with references and not by personal judgments. -The challenges in terms of disparities in access to ICTE, technological and human factors must be included in discussion and presented in form of a summary diagram. -Evoking a successful model (Benchmark) in the field of ICTE can enrich the discussion. -In terms of recommendations, you mentioned at the beginning of your search for a device that is "The operating framework", and you defined it as "a coherent set of material and human resources, strategies, methods and actors interacting in a given context to achieve a goal". This is to promote the use of ICT in your district. I don't see all of these elements in the framework of your recommendations: Teachers, Students and partners (who are these partners?), Environment? and of course the strategies and methods used in ICT should be mentioned. A diagram will be very useful.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion needed some elaboration, it should brings out in a concrete way the appropriate solutions and what are the prospects of future research in this field?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
Very limited references compared to the richness of the subject. To be completed with recent and updated scientific references	

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):

Actually, The ICTE notes a great importance. It concerns the use of all resources such as ; software, digital manuals, data and information banks, personal work tools, simulators, collective networking. Also, it concerns ICTE tools for teaching; notably, computer-based teaching, e-learning, ENT, ENA, BIT and social networks. It was necessary to think about exploiting this richness of information, in a chapter devoted to the «theoretical context» that follow the introduction part.

Countries that have successfully introduced ICT into education system, they have already developed a government strategy for success. What are these strategies? And what are the best practices? The theoretical context helps us to identify the problem and to imagine solutions that are more concrete.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The subject very interesting. It just needs to be supported with a theoretical context to bring out more specific recommendations in the form of a summary diagram. Paper can be published after taking in consideration our suggestions and answering to the questions.

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: Adil BOUYAHYA	
University/Country: Crmef Fès- Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:03/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/08/2023
Manuscript Title: **DIFFUSION DES TIC DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT SECONDAIRE GÉNÉRAL DU DISTRICT DE YAMOUSSOUKRO (CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : ÉTAT DES LIEUX ET DÉFIS À RELEVER .**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0515/23	
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.	**3**
L'intitulé de la recherche reprend parfaitement la teneur de cet article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**

Effectivement, le résumé initial retrace clairement les objectifs, la méthodologie et les aboutissements.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**1**
- **Des erreurs d'orthographe de construction à rectifier (certaines sont marquées en jaune).** - **Il faut marquer l'alinéa pour les débuts de paragraphes.**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
Le trio demeure fortement lié à sa méthodologie, quant aux résultats de l'investigation, ils sont clairement mis en exergue.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
Les résultats de la recherche semblent valides, ils sont étayés par un arsenal statistique et des données de localisation.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
La conclusion doit s'étoffer advantage.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**2**
Les références semblent corrects, à enricher.	

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):
L'article est pertinent, il demeure fort intéressant de rectifier les dites erreurs.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
L'article respecte les conventions de la recherche scientifiques, toutefois, il semble urgent de redresser les quelques recommandations.