



Paper: “Un Demi Siècle D’évaluation De L’activité De L’upwelling De La Côte Atlantique Marocaine”

Corresponding Author: Karim HILMI

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p89

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Najih Mohamed NFRI/Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Elkalay Khalid Cadi Ayyad/ Morocco

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Mohamed NAJIH	
University/Country: NFRI/Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: June 20,2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June 29, 20202
Manuscript Title: Activité de l’upwelling de la côte atlantique marocaine sur la période 1967-2019	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title corresponds to the content of the article although “half a century” can have a particular connotation (Personal point of view)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The summary remains in general and does not present results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Very slight spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology is well defined and presented	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Some interpretations may have different points of view	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
well defined	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
One reference is not in the list	
The order must be reviewed in two references	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Mohamed NAJIH	
University/Country: NFRI/Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: June 20,2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June 29, 20202
Manuscript Title: Activité de l’upwelling de la côte atlantique marocaine sur la période 1967-2019	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title corresponds to the content of the article although “half a century” can have a particular connotation (Personal point of view)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The summary remains in general and does not present results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Very slight spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology is well defined and presented	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Some interpretations may have different points of view	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
well defined	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
One reference is not in the list	
The order must be reviewed in two references	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):