



Paper: “Organizational Modes and Water Service Performance: A 1995–2025 Meta-Analysis and Implications for PPPs and Regional Multiservice Companies (SRMs) in Morocco”

Submitted: 04 October 2025

Accepted: 04 February 2026

Published: 28 February 2026

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Charaf Elouafai

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n4p141

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hamzo Khan Tagar

College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Elisabetta Venezia

Department of Economics and Finance, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Italy

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: 3.12.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 30.01.2026
Manuscript Title: Organizational Modes and Water Service Performance: A 1995–2025 Meta-Analysis and Implications for PPPs and Regional Multiservice Companies (SRMs) in Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1056/25	
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: no	
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
<i>I think that the title is strong, appropriate, and well aligned with the manuscript’s content and scope.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Strong integration of theories The paper effectively integrates transaction-cost economics, principal-agent theory, incomplete contracting, relational governance, and public value perspectives into a unified analytical framework. This pluralistic approach is suitable for the intricacies of water governance.</i>	
<i>Methodological precision and openness Following the rules of PRISMA 2020</i>	

<p><i>Correct management of dependent effect sizes utilizing CR2 robust variance estimation</i> <i>Comprehensive robustness and publication bias assessments (PET-PEESE, trim-and-fill, selection models)</i></p> <p><i>Original empirical contribution</i> <i>This contribution covers a longer time period (1995–2025) than most others in the field.</i> <i>Adding governance, equity, and environmental outcomes to PPP reviews goes beyond just looking at efficiency.</i> <i>Very important for policy</i> <i>The talk about Morocco's SRM reform is timely and based on evidence from other countries, giving regulators and policymakers useful information.</i></p> <p><i>A clear and careful understanding of the results</i> <i>The authors correctly focus on heterogeneity, prediction intervals, and conditional effects, which stops them from making too broad of a statement.</i></p>	
<p>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>Make sure that the terms used for organizational modes are the same (for example, "delegated management" vs. "PPP/delegated").</i> <i>Check again for small spelling mistakes and make sure that the formatting of the references is consistent (for example, spacing and punctuation in citations).</i></p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
<p><i>The methodology of the study is presented with clarity and extensive detail, demonstrating a significant degree of rigor and transparency. The authors clearly explain the PRISMA-based search strategy, the criteria for including and excluding studies, how the outcomes were classified, and how the effect size was calculated. This lets the reader know how the evidence base was put together and evaluated. The selection of random-effects models, along with robust variance estimation and multilevel sensitivity analyses, is suitable due to the existence of dependent effect sizes and significant heterogeneity, and these selections are well substantiated. The treatment of moderators, publication-bias diagnostics, and robustness checks enhances the credibility of the findings.</i> <i>The methods section must be technical, but it is still well-organized and easy for people who know how to do quantitative synthesis to read. Minor streamlining or signposting could make it easier for non-experts to read, but this doesn't change the clarity or completeness of the methodological exposition. In general, the methods are well explained.</i></p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>4.5</p>
<p><i>The results are shown in a clear, logical, and well-organized way, with tables and narrative explanations that are consistent and easy to understand. The effect sizes, confidence intervals, and measures of heterogeneity that were reported all make sense and match the methods that were used. The authors analyze the results carefully. The conclusions the authors draw from the results are supported by the evidence they give. No inconsistencies or mistakes are found. A little condensation might make it easier to read, but the results section is mostly correct, clear, and ready for publication.</i></p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>4.5</p>

The conclusions are correct, well-balanced, and based on the evidence presented in the manuscript. The authors correctly bring together the main empirical findings and make clear connections between them and the theoretical framework and research questions. The results of the meta-analysis consistently support claims about how well different organizational modes work under certain conditions, the role of governance and incentives, and the policy implications for Morocco. The discussion doesn't make too many generalizations and clearly states its limits, which makes the conclusions more believable. In general, the last part makes sense, is based on evidence, and fits well with the rest of the study.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

5

The references are complete, current, and very appropriate for the study's goals and scope.

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):

Accept with Small Changes

The manuscript meets all the scientific, methodological, and editorial standards. The requested changes are only for clarification and presentation, and they don't change the research's validity or originality. After these small issues are fixed, the paper can be a strong and important addition to the literature on public service delivery and water governance.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: