



JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Educational Sciences Research Laboratory

Instructions to evaluators

Dear reviewers, peer review is a very essential activity of scientific publishing. It fulfills two key functions:

- Act as a filter: The reviewer must ensure that the proposed manuscript is properly checked before it is published.
- Improve the quality of research: Rigorous review by other experts helps to refine key points and correct unintentional errors.

1. Be invited to evaluate a manuscript

Being chosen to evaluate an article manuscript is an honor, a recognition of your skills, your expertise in the field concerned with the manuscript.

1.1. Does the article you are invited to evaluate really correspond to your specialty?

It may be that the editor-in-chief who contacted you does not know your profile and specialty. Only accept an evaluation if you are competent to examine the manuscript that has been sent to you.

1.2. Do you have time to evaluate the manuscript?

Evaluating an article manuscript can be time-consuming. The time needed for instruction can vary greatly between disciplines and, of course, depending on the type of paper, but on average, an article takes about two weeks to be properly evaluated. Will you have this period before the deadline to carry out an in-depth investigation? If you cannot evaluate within this timeframe, notify the publisher immediately.

1.3. Are there any potential conflicts of interest?

The manuscript submitted to your expert opinion is completely anonymous. A conflict of interest will not necessarily prevent you from evaluating a manuscript article. But if you have already been in contact with this manuscript, please inform the publisher so that he can make an informed decision.

2. Conduct the review

The review must be conducted confidentially. The item you have been asked to review must not be disclosed to any third party. If you wish to obtain the opinion of your colleagues or students in the article, you must inform the publisher in advance. Most editors are open to additional comments, but those involved will also need to keep the review process confidential. When you submit your direction, please be aware that any recommendations you make will contribute to the editor's final decision. You should rate the item based on the following:

2.1. Originality

- Is the article new and interesting enough to warrant publication?
- Does it add to the canon of knowledge?
- Does the article adhere to the journal standard?
- Is the research question important?



JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Educational Sciences Research Laboratory

You may want to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any articles that have already been published on the subject. If the research has already been covered, forward the references of this work to the publisher.

2.2. Structure of the article

Is the article clearly presented?

Are all the key elements (if any) present: summary (French and English), introduction, methodology, results/discussions, conclusions?

2.2.1. Title

Does it clearly describe the article?

2.2.2. Summary

Is the structure (context, objective, methodology, results, conclusion) respected?

Does it reflect the content of the article?

If any highlights are included, please check the content and, if possible, suggest improvements.

2.2.3. Introduction

Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve with precision and does it clearly pose the problem of the study?

Normally, the introduction should summarize the relevant salient parts, provide context and review literature, recounting what other authors have found, if any, have been found to challenge. It is appropriate for the authors to contextualize, ask the research question(s), propose hypotheses and the objectives of the research.

2.2.4. Methodology

- Does the author explain precisely how the data was collected and processed?
- Are they suitable to answer the question(s) asked?
- Is the methodology detailed enough for you to replicate the research?
- Does the article identify the procedures followed?
- Are they ordered in any meaningful way?
- If the methods are new, are they explained in detail?
- Was the sampling appropriate?
- Does the article specify what type of data was recorded?

2.2.5. Results and discussion

This is where the author(s) should explain what they/have discovered during the research. They should be clearly presented according to logic.

- Will you need to determine if the proper analysis has been performed?
- Are the statistics correct?

If you are not comfortable with statistics, please let the publisher know when you submit your report.



JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Educational Sciences Research Laboratory

- Are the analyses corroborated with the results, do they seem reasonable?
- Did the authors indicate the relationship between the results, expectations, and previous research?
- Does the article support or contradict previous theories?

2.2.6. Conclusion

Does the conclusion explain how research has advanced the body of scientific knowledge?

2.2.7. Shape

If an article is poorly written due to grammatical errors, it can be more difficult to understand. You should, however, bring this to the attention of the publisher.

- Finally, on the whole, do the figures and tables inform the reader?
- Are they called in the text?
- Do the numbers accurately describe the data?
- Are they consistent, for example the bars in the graphs are the same width, the scales on the axis are logical?

2.2.8. Previous Research

- If the article is based on previous research, does it refer to recent manuscripts?
- Are there any important works that have been omitted?
- Are the references accurate?

3. Ethical issues

3.1. Plagiarism

If you believe that an article is a substantial copy of a previously published work, please inform the editor, citing the work in as much detail as possible.

3.2. Fraud

It is very difficult to detect the fraudster, but if you think the results of an article are false, discuss it with the publisher.

4. Communicate your report to the publisher

Once you've completed your review of the article, the next step is to write your report. It is a question of filling in the evaluation sheet attached to the manuscript. This has a dual purpose: to remind the publisher of the details of the manuscript and to also reassure the author and publisher that you have understood the article. If you ever need to make comments, they should be courteous and constructive and not include personal remarks.

NB: Most of these instructions are taken from the website:

<https://aflash-revue-mdou.org/guide-dun-evaluateur/>



JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Educational Sciences Research Laboratory

Contact :

Educational Sciences Research Laboratory (LARSCED)

Ecole Normale Supérieure (ENS)

Marien Ngouabi University (UMNG)

www.lakisa.larsced.cg

revue.lakisa@larsced.cg

revue.lakisa@umng.cg

BP : 237, Brazzaville-Congo