

Paper: “Les déterminants de la divulgation des informations RSE : une comparaison entre les pays développés et les pays en développement à travers une revue de littérature empirique”

Submitted: 05 October 2024

Accepted: 30 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Ghizlane Youssef

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p207](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p207)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oumar Bah
Sup' Management, Mali

Reviewer 2: Mahamat Alhadji
Department of Sciences of Education, Higher Teachers Training College (HTTC)
University of Maroua, Cameroon

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 Oumar BAH Maître Assistant du CAMES	
University/Country: Sup'Management - Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Les déterminants de la divulgation des informations RSE : une comparaison entre les pays développés et les pays en développement à travers une revue de littérature empirique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 50.10.2024	
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: 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>Le titre est adapté au contenu de l'article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Les objets, méthodes et résultats sont très bien clarifiés</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>L'article présente quelques fautes d'orthographe qu'il faille corriger</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthodologie est clairement expliquée dans l'article</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats et la discussion des résultats sont adaptés</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion et le résumé de l'article s'adaptent au contenu</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont adaptées. Cependant, il faut numéroter la bibliographie de façon à voir clairement les 89 documents utilisés</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):

Les auteurs doivent prendre en compte les révisions mineures mentionnées dans l'article.

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: MAHAMAT ALHADJI	
University/Country: CAMEROON	
Date Manuscript Received: 17 OCT 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 21 OCT 2024
Manuscript Title: Les déterminants de la divulgation des informations RSE : une comparaison entre les pays développés et les pays en développement à travers une revue de littérature empirique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1050/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OUI	
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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	3
IL DOIT ETRE REVU EN FONCTION DES CORRECTIONS DU RESUME	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4

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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
IL FAUT REVOIR LES REFERENCES SELON LA METHODE APA7	

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):

IL FAUT FAIRE DES PETITS PARAGRAPHES. HARMONISER LE CONCEPT EN VOIE DE DEVELOPPEMENT AVEC EN DEVELOPPEMENT QUI EST PLUS APPROPRIE AUJOURD'UI ;

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: RAS