ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. 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 review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper.
You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 22.02.2018	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 3.15.2018
Manuscript Title: **L'apport Des Marchés De Capitaux Au Financement Des PME Marocaines**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 144.12.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
The paper at hand does contain significant information. However, it is mostly based on information that already exists. The new addition that this paper brings is the interpretation and analysis of that existing information that was gathered from various sources.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
The paper does demonstrate a significantly adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field; notions are clearly defined and the concepts discussed are coherent with the topic and field of research.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**2**
- The language used is clear and understandable. Very minor spelling, punctuation, and grammar mistakes are present, in that regard further revision can be sought.	
- The English version of the abstract must be revised as the translation could use	

improvements.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
It does not appear that there is a clear methodology that was followed as there is no new qualitative or quantitative study. The tables and graphs that were developed by the authors based on other sources are adequately put and analysed.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**5**
Yes, the paper clearly identifies several implications primarily from a theoretical and secondarily from a practical perspective through the display and comparison of statistical figures of various parameters relative to the topic at hand throughout a defined period of time, which bridges the gap between theory and practice. The present paper explains the ways that Moroccan SMEs can benefit from direct financing of by the capital market and the actions needed to be carried out in this context, which could be a useful resource for new SMEs. It can also be used academically as a base to conduct further research on the topic from a practical perspective, and/or, or help students gain insights on the matter as it is rather a comprehensive article that gathers and compares various elements and this can be useful for future entrepreneurs.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
Yes, the results are properly analysed and presented in a clear manner, and the conclusion ties all together with numerous elements of the paper. Encouraged to state limitations and future improvements that can be brought to the paper, as well as an appendix with the tables' titles.	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style. *(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)*	**5**
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: