Paper: **"Balanced Scorecard (BSC) : Révolution Financière des Établissements Publics"**

Corresponding Author: Sabhi Rajae

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Andrianarizaka Marc Tiana
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

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: ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc	
University/Country: Université Antsiranana/ Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/04/24	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/05/24
Manuscript Title: **L'utilité de la Balanced Scorecard (BSC) dans l'évaluation des stratégies de financement à l'ère de la numérisation des établissements publics**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0459/24	
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**
Bien que le titre soit intellectuellement captivant, il risque d'être intimidant ou de dissuader les lecteurs moins familiers de l'économie et de la numérique.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
Correcte	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Correcte	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthode présentée est objective.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont clairs et cadrent bien le sujet traité.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion relève tous les points essentiels de l'article et permet de mieux saisir le thème. L'ouverture est assez objective.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3,5
Correct	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La conclusion de cet article, bien qu'exprimée clairement, ne semble pas entièrement alignée avec les résultats énoncés auparavant. Cette discordance suggère un écart entre les analyses détaillées et leurs synthèses finales, laissant le lecteur dans une certaine perplexité.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: