

Paper: “Évaluer et accompagner les enseignants : des articulations pour un modèle à référence humaine d’autoévaluation de l’établissement scolaire”

Submitted: 01 May 2024

Accepted: 13 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: Kaoutara Elomari

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n22p149](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n22p149)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lahoucine Aguinou
Université Mohamed V, Rabat, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Kisembo Isaac
Universite de Bunia, Congo

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: 10/07/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Évaluer et accompagner : des articulations pour un modèle à référence humaine	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 05.---34.05.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: oui	

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>Le titre est clair</i> Optionnellement, en bas de la page du titre, des informations additionnelles sur l’auteur pourraient être ajoutées, y compris les adresses, adresses électroniques, et ORCID ID.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Au moins 5 mots clés (voir les directives)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Phrases longues</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Justifier le texte pour raffiner l'apparence</i>	

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):

Le travail est excellent.

Les suggestions et les remarques sont :

- Respecter les directives de l'auteur (titre, noms des auteurs, texte et références)
- Les phrases sont longues
- Les références à justifier pour raffiner l'apparence du travail

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!

Reviewer Name: KISEMBO	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE DE BUNIA/ RD CONGO	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/07/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Évaluer et accompagner : des articulations pour un modèle à référence humaine	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0534/24	
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.	2
Le titre de l'étude est moins précis et non concis, les auteurs sont restés très vagues dans la formulation de leurs sujets. La reformulation s'avère importante.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
Le résumé est moins récapitulatif. Ne contient ni l'objectif, ni l'ébauche de la méthodologie, ni les résultats saillants.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

Quelques erreurs grammaticales et de forme ont émaillé l'article. Les paragraphes non agencés, l'interligne (1,0) et le style de référence non conforme aux règles de référencement APA.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
La méthodologie utilisée n'apparaît pas clairement dans l'article. Les auteurs doivent clarifier les méthodes et techniques de recherche utilisées. Ceci car, la fiabilité des résultats en dépend.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Les résultats sont absurdes. Ils doivent être clairement présentés dans une rubrique mise en part.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Il se fait observer une discordance entre le contenu et la conclusion. La conclusion est partielle et non générale. On note l'absence de plusieurs éléments essentiels de l'étude dans la conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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): Les études sur l'efficacité des systèmes éducatifs s'avèrent importantes à nos jours. Cependant, les démarches méthodologiques doivent être appropriées et doivent conduire à des résultats clairs et précis. En utilisant les techniques comme le questionnaire d'enquête impose l'étude de fiabilité et de validité de l'instrument etc. Les techniques d'analyse des données n'apparaissent nulle part. Ça remet en question les résultats. Je vous recommande la révision générale de l'article. La problématique, le cadre théorique, la méthodologie empruntée, les résultats et discussion des résultats doivent tous apparaître clairement dans le corps de l'article, afin de lui donner un fond et une forme scientifique. Très cordialement.