



Paper: “Panorama de l'évolution des dépenses publiques au Maroc : Analyse historique et implications économiques”

Submitted: 19 July 2024

Accepted: 14 August 2025

Published: 31 August 2025

Corresponding Author: Abdelilah Skikra

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n22p164

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouakou Kouakou Paul-Alfred
Universite Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Cote d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Andrianarizaka Marc
Université Antananarivo, Madagascar

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: Pr ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc	
University/Country: Université Antananarivo / Université Catholique Madagasikara	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/07/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Panorama of the Evolution of Public Expenditures in Morocco: Historical Analysis and Economic Implications	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0809/24	
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:	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [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> Le titre est pertinent, il exprime clairement le sujet de l'article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Bonne illustration en anglais du su jet	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Correct dans l'ensemble	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Il serait plus judicieux de mettre en exergue dans l'article d'une part les axes d'informations à collecter avec les utilisées et d'autre part, les méthodes de traitement et d'analyses des données collectées.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont intéressants. Il est souhaitable que les discussions soient mises à part mais non combinées avec les résultats.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acceptable	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Correcte	

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):

L'article est intéressant mais gagnerait à avoir un axe directeur bien clair pour asseoir un travail scientifique.

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: KOUAKOU KOUAKOU PAUL-ALFRED	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE PELEFORO GON COULIBALY – COTE D’IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Panorama de l'évolution des dépenses publiques au Maroc : Analyse historique et implications économiques	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0809/24	
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: NO	

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. (Please insert your comments)	2
LE TITRE EST CLAIR, MAIS PAS SUFFISAMMENT TRAITE A L'AIDE DE METHODES APPROPRIEES	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) RIEN DU TOUT	2
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments)	4

RIEN A SIGNALER	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> PAS DE METHODOLOGIE	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'ABSENCE DE METHODOLOGIE NE PERMET PAS D'APPRECIER LA PERTINENCE DES RESULTATS	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LA MEME OBSERVATION	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> LES REFERENCES SONT INSUFFISANTES ET NE SONT PAS APPROPRIEES	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

CE DOCUMENT NE PEUT ETRE PUBLIE. IL DOIT ETRE REECRI. IL FAUT SUIVRE LE CANEVAS DE REDACTION DES ARTICLES SCIENTIFIQUES POUR L'AMELIORER.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: