

Paper: “L’éducation, l’unique frein pouvant ralentir, voire arrêter l’exploitation abusive de l’environnement, dans le cadre du développement durable, cas de la Région Boeny”

Submitted: 27 July 2024

Accepted: 15 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Tsimisanda Basile

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p293](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p293)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Amine Siba
Moulay Ismail University, Morocco

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:	
University/Country: Moulay Ismail University/ Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/11/2024
Manuscript Title: L'éducation, l'unique frein pouvant ralentir, voire arrêter l'exploitation abusive de l'environnement, dans le cadre du développement durable, cas de la Région Boeny	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0822/24	
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: 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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>I would say there are some repetitions. And some sentences that can be formulated in better ways.</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.	5
<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

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

As for the study it's very good job, but talking about the form there are some points to improve and some errors to correct.

You've been using some abbreviations without saying what they stand for (as per KESSP).

The aesthetic of the document needs to be reviewed (ex: the space between the paragraph isn't homogeneous).

Correct please some minor errors as:

- Page 6 : "X terrain de foot" a number needs to be add instead of the X.
- Page 8 : "La Région de Boeny, couvrant une superficie de 29 km²" it's not the correct surface. And also, you gave this information 2 times in the same paragraph (repetition again).