EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"The Role of Individual Performance in the Effect of ICT Appropriation on Educational Performance of Students in Public Universities in the Casablanca-Settat Region, Morocco"**

Submitted: 26 July 2024
Accepted: 30 September 2024
Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Zineb Belkebir

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p67

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aymen Alqaradaghy
Komar University of Science and Technology, Iraq

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is not clear enough especially with the use of ICTE with any meaning of "E"
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract of this manuscript is lacking in key elements of the methodology. Equally, the results at the abstract are not clear and specific.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There are a couple of grammatical errors detected in the body of the work
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methods of this work are not clearly explained especially the steps involved in the indirect investigation
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Thé body of this work requires major modifications. Indirect interaction between variables is something that should be clearly investigated and recorded
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion cannot be considered to be fully supported by the content because the content requires review
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The list of references is not appropriate for a study of this era.
Very old citations are used in this study making the work not to be recent.
Citations should not be older than 2019 except in the case of major authors
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
1. In the debates surrounding this study, the authors should justify the inclusion of the mediating variable (individual performance)
2. Select an author with a framework on mediation to draw inspiration that can guide the work. For example Baron and Kenny (1986)

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clrearly presents the article.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Check the grammar and spelling again in all parts including the tables.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The study methods are explained clearly.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The literature review need to be reviewed from the authors. adding more references especially new references 2020 and above including the introduction.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion is accurate.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
References need to be checked again especially old references need to be supported with the new references.
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
