

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

**Manuscript No.: IJAR-55237**

**Title: De l'éthique de l'inspecteur de l'enseignement : connaître pour bien agir en education.**

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....  
**√Accept after minor revision.....**  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity			√	
Significance		√		

Reviewer Name: **Dr. Touseef Malik**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents a philosophically grounded and empirically informed reflection on the ethics of education inspectors, drawing on professional practices within the Senegalese context. The study addresses an important and underexplored dimension of educational governance. While the conceptual depth and empirical grounding are strong, the manuscript requires moderate refinement in structure, conciseness, and analytical focus to enhance clarity and readability.

**Recommendation:** Accept after minor revision

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

### STRENGTHS

1. The study addresses a significant ethical gap in the professional practice of education inspectors.
2. The integration of empirical data from inspectors and teachers strengthens the practical relevance of the ethical discussion.
3. The manuscript demonstrates strong philosophical grounding, drawing on Kant, Morin, Spinoza, and contemporary ethical theory.
4. The identification and categorization of professional, moral, intellectual, and human values are clearly articulated.
5. The discussion successfully links ethical principles to educational quality and teacher dignity.

### WEAKNESSES

# International Journal of Advanced Research

**Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP**

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

1. The manuscript is lengthy and would benefit from condensation to improve readability.
2. Some sections contain dense philosophical exposition with limited synthesis for applied readers.
3. Methodological procedures, though described, could be summarized more concisely.
4. Repetition of ethical arguments occurs across results and discussion sections.
5. Minor language and formatting inconsistencies require editorial revision.