



Paper: “The Relevant Market as a Juridical Construct: Its Origins and Evolution under Moroccan and European Competition Law”

Submitted: 04 September 2025

Accepted: 10 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Mohamed El Azhary

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n29p87

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Magda Ositashvili
University of Hamburg, Germany

Reviewer 2: Murry Siyasiya
Blantyre International University, Malawi

Reviewer 3: Fathi Zerari
Souk-Ahras University, Algeria

Reviewer 4: Emina Jerković
University of Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Croatia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Magda Ositashvili	
University/Country: University of Hamburg, Germany	
Date Manuscript Received: 6 September 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 9 September
Manuscript Title: The acceptance of relevant market in Moroccan and European competition law: origins and evolution.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: N/A	
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:	

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.	3
<i>The title could be made more precise in order to clearly reflect the specific focus of the research.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	1
<i>The abstract is too brief and does not adequately present the research objectives, methodology, and findings, thereby failing to provide a comprehensive overview of the study.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>A minor correction is needed.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>A brief clarification of the methodological approach, along with a more detailed description of the study methods, would strengthen the article.</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are adequate.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Conclusion is accurate.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Prof. Fathi ZERARI	
University/Country: Souk-Ahras university, Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/09/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/09/2025
Manuscript Title: The Relevant Market as a Juridical Construct: its Origins and Evolution under Moroccan and European Competition Law	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0945/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Yes, the title is accurate and descriptive; it gives a concise , but perfect idea about the content (avoid a period at the end of the title of the article).	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3.5
The abstract successfully outlines the object (the issue of instrumentalizing the relevant market definition in Moroccan and European law) and the methods (a twofold approach: historical/doctrinal analysis of economic thought and a legal/juridical approach). As for the results, the author could have been more explicit in stating the specific results , which are clearly stated in the "Results of the study" section..	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5

The overall quality of the paper is good, but because it seems to me translated from French to English, there are some pitfalls. For example:	
1. Capitalization inconsistency (influence of French); 2. "market ecosystem" , not well translated; 3. "understanding", not apprehension (false friends); 4. "first-rate surgical breakthrough" and "vexatiously reject", "magnates defending the competitive ecosystem" , to be paraphrased;	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Yes: a twofold approach: historical/comparative analysis of economic thought and a legal/juridical approach.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clearly stated and well grounded. They identify two key characteristics of the relevant market:	
1. The market as a <i>de facto</i> economic tool, recognized by law; 2. The market's function as a framework for analyzing company behavior and competition.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
The conclusion is accurate and concise. It reiterates the necessity of defining the relevant market to address barriers to access and ensure equality and its role as an instrumental step in legal analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Yes. The reference list is highly comprehensive and entirely appropriate..	
They are relevant, and well-formatted, including the author's article.	

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):

The author has succeeded in navigating economic theory and jurisprudential practice, to address an important economic concept, which law recognizes and instrumentalizes to maintain competitive balance, legal certainty, and economic fairness. I think that the article is worth publishing in the ESJ.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22.9.2025.	Date Review Report Submitted: 1.10.2025.
Manuscript Title: The Relevant Market as a Juridical Construct: its Origins and Evolution under Moroccan and European Competition Law.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0945/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract presents objects and methods used in the paper but it is perhaps too long.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The paper is grammatically and stylistically well-written.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are explained clearly in chapter about methodology and plan of the study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The body of the paper clearly shows conceptualization of the legal criteria that promote the organization of competitive inflows within the market in accordance to Moroccan and European legal standards.	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion of the paper summarizes the results obtained from the research and corresponds to the body of the paper. In the conclusion, based on the findings of the study, the researcher gives recommendations which is meritorious. The only complaint is that the conclusion is too long and could be more concise.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The sources of literature are numerous and recent and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is methodologically correct, it analyzes in detail the topic of the effect legal criteria that promote the organization of competitive inflows within the market in accordance to Moroccan and European legal standards. It raises open questions, problems, shortcomings and gaps. The conclusion of the paper summarizes the results obtained from the research and corresponds to the body of the paper. In the conclusion, based on the findings of the study, the researcher gives recommendations which is meritorious. The only complaint is that the conclusion is too long and could be more concise.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: