



Paper: “L’étude de cas comme levier d’apprentissage et d’évaluation dans le système LMD : apports pédagogiques et conditions d’efficacité aux études en psychologie”

Submitted: 20 January 2026

Accepted: 10 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Josué Ngwej Mpandamadi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n7p195

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benbrahim Mohamed

Centre Regional des Métiers de l’Education et de la Formation d’Inezgane (CRMEF), Morocco

Reviewer 2: Jalila Achouaq Aazim

University Mohammed V, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Diboh Emmanuel

Université Jean LOROUGNON GUEDE de Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: Jalila Achouaq AAZIM	
University, Country: University Mohammed V Rabat Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 février	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: L'étude de cas comme levier d'apprentissage et d'évaluation dans le système LMD : apports pédagogiques et conditions d'efficacité aux études en psychologie	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0212/26	
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:	

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
Clarté et concision <i>Le titre identifie clairement l'objet d'étude à savoir : le dispositif étudié, la finalité, le cadre institutionnel, le context disciplinaire et le terrain institutionnel</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
Rigueur <i>La structure du résumé est logique et synthétique. Tous les éléments attendus dans un résumé scientifiques sont présents.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

Niveau linguistique très satisfaisant <i>Le texte est marqué par une cohérence stylistique tout au long de l'article. La syntaxe est claire. La terminologie scientifique est maîtrisée.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Méthodologie bien développée <i>La transparence méthodologique est remarquable. Le lecteur comprend comment l'analyse a été conduite.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Les résultats sont logiquement articulés avec la problématique. Ils sont cohérents avec la méthodologie et s'appuient sur la littérature scientifique citée.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
Conclusion cohérente <i>La conclusion est cohérente avec les résultats et s'aligne avec la méthodologie appliquée. Elle récapitule les apports pédagogiques, les conditions d'efficacité et les limites de l'étude.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Solide bibliographie <i>L'auteur s'appuie sur des auteurs de référence (Biggs, Kolb, Hattie, Prince, etc.). Il consulte des documents cohérents avec les fondements théoriques et la validations empiriques qu'il suggère dans son article.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: DIBOH EMMANUEL	
University, Country: Université Jean LOROUGNON GUEDE de Daloa/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 19/02/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/03/2026
Manuscript Title: L'étude de cas comme levier d'apprentissage et d'évaluation dans le système LMD : apports pédagogiques et conditions d'efficacité aux études en psychologie	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0212/26	
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.

<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. <i>Titre clair et en adéquation avec le contenu du document.</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results. <i>Le résumé présente bien les objectifs, méthodes et les résultats.</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>Texte bien écrit avec très peu de coquilles.</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>La méthodologie est correcte</i>	4
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. <i>Les résultats sont acceptables et cohérents</i>	3.5

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont en adéquation avec le thème traité</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>Les références sont variées et relativement récentes.</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):

Bon travail dans l'ensemble. Cependant, juste deux suggestions :

- *Page 420, Sous chapitre Objectif et question de recherche, ligne 7 : A la question « En quoi l'étude de cas constitue-t-elle un dispositif pertinent d'apprentissage et d'évaluation des compétences dans le système LMD à l'Université de Lubumbashi ? », j'aurais préféré « l'étude de cas peut-elle constituer un dispositif pertinent d'apprentissage et d'évaluation des compétences dans le système LMD à l'Université de Lubumbashi ? »*
- *Page 420, chapitre méthodologie, ligne 3 :il n'est pas nécessaire d'affirmer que « Ce choix méthodologique est cohérent avec l'objectif principal... » car c'est parce que vous l'avez estimé bon et cohérent que vous l'avez utilisé !*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Aucun commentaire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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: BENBRAHIM MOHAMED	
University, Country: Centre Régional des Métiers de l'Education et de la Formation Souss-Massa, Inezgane, Maroc (CRMEF)	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/02/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/02/2026
Manuscript Title: L'étude de cas comme levier d'apprentissage et d'évaluation dans le système LMD : apports pédagogiques et conditions d'efficacité aux études en psychologie	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0212/26	
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.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
Rien à signaler	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Voir quelques remarques dans le texte de l'article	
Il y a des références qui n'existent pas dans les références bibliographiques	

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):

Voir les remarques sur l'article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: