

Paper: “Pedagogical Reforms in the Initial Training of Moroccan Teachers: The Emergence of a New Training Paradigm and New Concepts”

Submitted: 16 April 2024

Accepted: 05 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: El Yadari Abdelbasset

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p62](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n23p62)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tamar Dolidze

Grigol Robakidze University & Batumi State Maritime Academy, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Anita Mandarić Vukušić

University of Split, Croatia

Reviewer 3: Nirmaljit K. Rathee

Delaware State University, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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. N. K. Rathee	
University/Country: Delaware State University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: June 29, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: July 23, 2024
Manuscript Title: Pedagogical reforms in the initial training of Moroccan teachers. The emergence of a new training paradigm and new concepts	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0504/24	
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: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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 accurately reflects the content and sets appropriate expectations for the subject matter discussed in the manuscript.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
While the abstract outlines the objective and methods effectively, a concise presentation of the results will enhance the value of the paper.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

The manuscript contains multiple grammatical errors and spelling mistakes, necessitating significant revisions to reach a professional standard.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods are well-explained, providing a good understanding of the approach taken by the author.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results section provides relevant information but could be articulated more clearly to better support the study's objectives and findings.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are well-supported by the content, effectively summarizing the findings and linking back to the research questions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are comprehensive and relevant, supporting the manuscript's content well; however, updating and including the latest studies could improve its academic rigor.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed <i>(Please refer to the Suggestions provided to the Author below)</i>	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The results section provides relevant information but could be articulated more clearly to better support the study's objectives.
- Updating and including the latest studies could improve the quality of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: 7.6.2024.	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.6.2024.
Manuscript Title: Pedagogical reforms in the initial training of Moroccan teachers, The emergence of a new training paradigm and new concepts	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0504/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>The title is not fully related to the content, i.e. more is stated in the title than in the text</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>In the end of conclusion there is a paragraph in French language.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	/
<i>According to the way the paper is written, this is more of a (professional) review paper than a research paper.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	/

<i>This was professional paper so I could not asses this question.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is supported by the content, but there was the paragraph in French.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>The references should be completed and should be noted in the text (content).</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper should be better structured, so that it has a theoretical elaboration of the content divided into sub-headings. Sources from the literature should be listed in the text itself. The literature should be edited and completed with a complete source.

The paper has potential, but the content should be arranged in the order of the chapters and without repeating the fundamental conclusions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

/