



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Profil topographique du site d’Illigh (Agadir, Maroc) et son exploitation scientifique et pédagogique dans la formation des professeurs stagiaires des SVT du CRMEF Souss-Massa”

Submitted: 11 May 2026

Accepted: 19 June 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Benbrahim

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n20p149

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gala Bi Trazié Jérémie
Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny Abidjan-Cocody, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: GALA Bi Trazié Jérémie	
University, Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny Abidjan-Cocody, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 st may 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 6 th june 2026
Manuscript Title: Profil topographique du site d'Illigh (Agadir, Maroc) et son exploitation scientifique et pédagogique dans la formation des professeurs-stagiaires SVT du CRMEF-SM	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0551/26	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is clear and adequate for the manuscript's content. However, it contains abbreviations whose meanings are not universally known; integrating the meaning of each of these abbreviations into the title might require a reformulation of the title.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>Although the methodology exists in the summary, it lacks some details, including the use of Global Mapper software for developing topographic profiles using the ICT method and the assessment of learning level through the self-assessment grid and the satisfaction rate.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Quite rare</i> <i>Some omissions of words (... consacrés à la biostratigraphie ... au lieu de ... consacrés biostratigraphie ...)</i> <i>site Illigh ou site d'Illigh, the second seems more appropriate.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The methodology is well described. However, some elements related to the methodology are also found in the results.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear and sufficient. However, they contain sections of varying importance that would have been suitable for the methodology section.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>RAS</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>he references are comprehensive and appropriate, however they need to be improved for the following reasons.</i> <i>Some references mentioned in the list of bibliographic references do not appear in the body of the manuscript</i> [9] Kerski, Joseph J. (2003). The implementation and effectiveness of geographic information systems technology and methods in secondary education. <i>Journal of Geography</i>, 102(3), 128–137.	

- [10] Kolb, David A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [16] Orion, Nir (1993). The outdoor as a central learning environment in the earth sciences. *Journal of Geological Education*, 41(4), 335–340.
- [18] Perrenoud, Philippe (2001). *Développer la pratique réflexive dans le métier d'enseignant*. Paris: ESF.
- [19] Robinson, Arthur H., Morrison, Joel L., Muehrcke, Phillip C., et al. (1995). *Elements of Cartography* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- [20] UNESCO (2011). *ICT Competency Framework for Teachers*. Paris: UNESCO.

2. *The repetition of certain references with slight differences when it is the same reference, as in the two references below.*

[13] Michard A. (1976). *Éléments de géologie marocaine. Notes et Mém. Serv. Carte géol. Maroc*, 252, 408 p.

[14] Michard, A. 1976. « *Éléments de géologie marocaine. Notes et Mémoires du Service Géologique du Maroc* »

3. *The style of presentation of references is not uniform across all references.*

- *In some cases, the year of publication is in parentheses; in other cases, the year is not shown in parentheses ; for example [1] Ambroggi, R.1963 et [2] Astolfi, J.-P. (2008)*

- *In some cases, the article title is enclosed in quotation marks, in other cases the title is not; for example [14] Michard, A. 1976. « *Éléments de géologie marocaine. Notes et Mémoires du Service Géologique du Maroc* » et [2] Astolfi, J.-P. (2008). *La saveur des savoirs*. ESF.*

- *In some cases the authors' full names are written out (Example: [11] Kurt Lewin (1946) et [18] Perrenoud, Philippe (2001)) , whereas the APA standard requires that only the last name be written out in full and the first names be abbreviated.*

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 manuscript is relatively good. It includes, in a basic way, all the elements necessary for writing a scientific article. However, the article could be improved by clearly highlighting certain points.

In the introduction, although the specific objectives were well stated, the overall objective of the work, which is broken down into these specific objectives, should also have been clearly stated.

In the methodology section, it would be beneficial to group all methodological information there to avoid revisiting these elements in other, non-dedicated sections, such as the results.

In the results section, the authors could remove all methodological information and place it in the appropriate section.

In the discussion, no bibliographic references were cited in the analysis of the results obtained.

In the list of references, it would be advisable to adhere to the APA style guidelines, as prescribed in the author guidelines.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: