**\*\*\* ENGLISH VERSION BELOW \*\*\***

logo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ARTICLE :** |  |
| **ÉVALUATEUR :** |  |

**1/ COMMENTAIRES SUR LE FOND** (cochez)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. Originalité du sujet traité  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| * 1. Qualité de l’approche théorique  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| * 1. Qualité de la démarche méthodologique  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| 1.4 Maîtrise et analyse des données   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| * 1. Qualité de la démonstration d’ensemble  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| 1.6 Pertinence des références   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |
|  |
| 1.7 Qualité générale de la contribution du texte à l’avancement des connaissances   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très fort |  | Fort |  | Moyen |  | Faible |  | Très faible |  | Absent |  | Ne s’applique pas | |

**2/ COMMENTAIRES SUR LA FORME** (cochez)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 Lisibilité du texte, clarté de la pensée   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très bien |  | Acceptable avec modifications mineures |  | Acceptable avec modifications majeures |  | Faible | |
|  |
| 2.2 Structure et organisation   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très bien |  | Acceptable avec modifications mineures |  | Acceptable avec modifications majeures |  | Faible | |
|  |
| 2.3 Style et correction grammaticale   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Très bien |  | Acceptable avec modifications mineures |  | Acceptable avec modifications majeures |  | Faible | |

**3/ RECOMMANDATION GLOBALE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Je recommande la publication de ce texte |
|  | **a) Sans modification**  L’article devrait être publié tel quel (compte tenu d’une révision orthographique si nécessaire) |
|  | **b) Avec modifications *mineures***  Le texte présente des défauts à corriger, mais qui n’affectent pas sa structure d’ensemble (l’accumulation de tels défauts reste du niveau des modifications « mineures ») |
|  | **c) Avec modifications *majeures***  Le texte présente des défauts de fond qui nécessitent une réécriture de portions significatives du texte (excluant l’accumulation de modifications mineures) |
|  |  |
|  | **d) Je recommande le *refus* de ce texte**  Le texte est impubliable |

4/ **COMMENTAIRES À L’AUTEUR**

*(Prenez l’espace qu’il vous faut pour écrire vos commentaires)*

**5/ COMMENTAIRES CONFIDENTIELS AU COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION (S’IL Y A LIEU)**

*(Prenez l’espace qu’il vous faut pour écrire vos commentaires)*

logo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TITLE:** |  |
| **REVIEWER:** |  |

**1/ BACKGROUND COMMENTS** (check)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. Subject’s interest and originality  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| * 1. Quality of theoretical approach  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| * 1. Quality of methodological approach  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| 1.4 Quality of data analysis   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| * 1. Argumentative quality  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| 1.6 Relevance of reference list   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |
|  |
| 1.7 Contribution to the advancement of knowledge   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Excellent |  | Very good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Weak |  | Very weak |  | Not applicable | |

**2/ COMMENTS ON THE STRUCTURE** (check)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 Paper’s legibility, clarity of thinking   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Very good |  | Acceptable, with minor changes |  | Acceptable, with major changes |  | Weak | |
|  |
| 2.2 Structure and overall organization   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Very good |  | Acceptable, with minor changes |  | Acceptable, with major changes |  | Weak | |
|  |
| 2.3 Style and use of language   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Very good |  | Acceptable, with minor changes |  | Acceptable, with major changes |  | Weak | |

**3/ RECOMMANDATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | I recommend the publication of this paper: |
|  | **a) unaltered**  The paper should be published as it is (taking into account an orthographic revision, the case being) |
|  | **b) with minor changes**  The paper presents certain weaknesses that do not affect its overall quality (the addition of such weaknesses also constitutes “minor changes”). The changes required of the author must be described in the next section. |
|  | **c) with major changes**  The paper presents significant weaknesses that require a major rewriting. The changes required of the author must be clearly explained in the next section. |
|  |  |
|  | **I recommend that this paper be rejected**  The reasons of the rejection must be fully justified in the next section. |

4/ **COMMENTS ADDRESSED TO THE AUTHOR**

*(Use all the space needed)*

**5/ CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD (IF NEED BE)**

*(Use all the space needed)*