



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Difficultés relatives à l’enseignement des Sciences de la Terre dans les classes secondaires qualifiantes de l’Académie de Drâa-Tafilalet : une étude empirique exploratoire à devis mixte”

Submitted: 28 May 2026

Accepted: 28 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Salahddine Didi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p151

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Salhi Mohamed
Sultan Moulay Slimane University, Beni Mellal, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Zakaria Faik Ouahab
Direction du ministère de l’éducation nationale, Marrakech, Maroc

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: SALHI MOHAMED	
University, Country: Sultan Moulay Slimane University, Beni Mellal, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: June 15, 2026	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Difficulties in Teaching Earth Sciences in Moroccan Qualifying Secondary School: A Mutidimensional Empirical Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1857-7881	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	No
The title "Difficulties in Teaching Earth Sciences in Moroccan Qualifying Secondary Schools: A Multidimensional Empirical Study" does not fully reflect this work. The study focuses on a single region (Draa Tafilalt) and does not represent the entire body of Earth and Life Sciences teachers nationwide.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	Yes
The author mentioned the work methodology, and results. The objectives are not clearly presented in the abstract.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes
The manuscript contains several spelling mistakes, especially in punctuation. In terms of grammar, the work adheres to French rules.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
The study methods are explained clearly but the information presented on the sample and the study area is insufficient.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	No
The results are not well presented; they contain an error in the calculations. Therefore, choosing this type of graph was not a good idea.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	No
The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content; It contains a synthesis of empirical results, a contextual interpretation, and finally operational recommendations, but it contains references such as the discussion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	No
The references are not entirely relevant; - Lack of recent research - Research conducted on a sample in a different area is not useful for this manuscript. - The presentation of the references did not adhere to the formatting, writing, and citation guidelines (APA 7th edition).	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------

Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Review the article title to better reflect the content of the work.
- Use recent research in the references.
- Review the calculations and the choice of graphs.
- In the methodology section, provide more details about the study area and the sample studied.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: