

Paper: **“Impact of the Distance Travelled to School on Students' Performance, Tardiness, and Absenteeism in Public Schools in Morocco”**

Submitted: 16 September 2024

Accepted: 17 December 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Hamid Bammou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p117](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n34p117)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ruth Aderanti
Babcock University, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Isaac Ogundu
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State, Nigeria

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!

Reviewer Name: RUTH A. ADERANTI	
University/Country: Babcock University/Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: Sept. 29, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: October 4, 2024
Manuscript Title: Impact of the distance travelled to school on students' performance in public schools in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1002/24	
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.

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>The research design, participants, instruments with the reliability score, and results need to be included in the abstract</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>Please see the comment in the body of the work.</i>	
The research question or the hypothesis need to be stated before the table of analysis then followed by the interpretation under the table. The authors need to adjust them	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Re-write the introduction to establish the problem (academic performance) and why is it an important problem to investigate.
2. The literature review did not reveal any gap in knowledge. The author need to show the gap.
3. Research questions or hypotheses must be stated before the table of analysis and the interpretations come after each table.
4. The discussion of the finding must be related to the existing literature or theory to affirm or reject the claims.

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: Professor Isaac Ogundu	
University/Country: Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 13-05-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 15-05-2024
Manuscript Title: Impact of the distance traveled to school on students' performance in public schools in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17---02.10.2024--	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Title is clear and apt for the purpose of discussion as a research work	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
Yes, the abstract summarized the researchers attempt to present objectives, methods and results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Yes, the abstract mentioned that the study uses univariate analysis, it should be the study used univariate analysis.	

The 4 th to last paragraph before conclusion stated the meal distance nstead of ‘mean’. Generalizability should be replaced with generalization.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Yes , but check comment section for concerns	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Yes, results are clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Researchers concluded the research in a concise manner.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
References are comprehensive and appropriate	

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):

Please effect grammatical errors corrections

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: