

**Paper: “Enseigner la lecture-écriture par la méthode syllabique : Une expérimentation formative”**

**Submitted: 16 November 2021**

**Accepted: 24 January 2022**

**Published: 31 January 2022**

Corresponding Author: Nzoussi Kevin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n2p80](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n2p80)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benie Aloh Jean Martial H.  
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Ackoundoun-Nguessan Kouame Sharll  
Ecole Normale Supérieure (ENS), Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Abdelali Kaaouachi,  
Mohammed I University, Morocco

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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.

*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: BENIE Aloh Jean Martial H.	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët Boigny / Institut Pédagogique National de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel (IPNETP) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received : 10/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted : 15/12/2021
Manuscript Title: Enseigner la lecture-écriture par la méthode syllabique : Une expérimentation formative.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1213/21	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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.  
***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: ACKOUNDOUN-NGUESSAN Kouamé Sharll	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/12/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/12/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Enseigner la lecture-écriture par la méthode syllabique : <i>Une expérimentation formative</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1213/21</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Le titre est pertinent et cadre avec le contenu de l'article.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
Le résumé prend en compte des différentes parties importantes du texte	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Quelques erreurs relevées. Voir dans le texte, les propositions sont mises en jaune.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
Le plan du travail pose des difficultés pour une meilleure lecture du travail. Les différentes parties ne sont pas ordonnées : lois et théories après la revue de littérature. La partie Matériel et méthodes est très longue. Le format standardisé IMRAD n'est pas respecté. La collecte est effectuée avant la description et le choix de la population cible. Les tableaux ne sont numérotés et manquent de légende.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
Les résultats ne sont pas clairement présentés. Ils ne sont pas discutés à la lumière des travaux antérieurs. La limite de validité des résultats n'est pas aussi discutée.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
La conclusion tient compte des éléments essentiels obtenus.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
References bibliographiques acceptables	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Les auteurs doivent respecter le format standardisé IMRAD  
Le travail doit être réorganisé.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Les résultats de l'étude sont intéressants.