

Manuscript: “**Modélisation Des Extrêmes Climatiques De La Région De La Marahoué À Partir D’un Générateur Stochastique De Temps Mono-Site (Weagets)**”

Submitted: 25 August 2020

Accepted: 02 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Yapi Assa Fabrice

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p70

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Koudamilaro Olivier,
Laboratoire d'Étude et de Recherche sur les Milieux et Territoires (LERMIT)
Université de Ouagadougou, Burkina-Faso

Reviewer 2: Agossou Gadedjisso-Tossou,
Univerite de Lome, Togos

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Saly Sambou,
Cheikh Anta Diop University

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:03/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/09/2020
Manuscript Title: MODÉLISATION DES EXTRÊMES HYDROCLIMATIQUES DE LA RÉGION DE LA MARAHOUE (CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : APPORT DU MODÈLE WEAGETS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.	2
<i>(L'auteur doit revoir le titre et ne pas dire extrêmes hydroclimatiques mais plutôt extrêmes pluviométriques)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Le résumé est acceptable dans l'ensemble)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(L'auteur doit se contenter de dire qu'il a collecter des données pluviométriques et non des données hydroclimatologiques)</i>	

5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(La bibliographie doit se présenter en tenant compte des normes de présentation de la revue)</i>	

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):

L'auteur doit prendre en compte les observations et il doit comprendre que son travail traite uniquement l'aspect pluie et non l'hydroclimatologie (qui est beaucoup plus vaste.

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: Agossou Gadedjisso-Tossou	Email:
University/Country: Universite de Lome, Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 Oct. 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 Oct. 2020
Manuscript Title: MODÉLISATION DES EXTRÊMES PLUVIOMÉTRIQUES DE LA RÉGION DE LA MARAHOUE (CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : APPORT DU MODÈLE WEAGETS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0928/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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
Le titre de l'article cadre bien avec son contenu	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Le résumé est bien présenté mais il manque les implications des résultats de l'étude pour la population	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Très peu d'erreurs grammaticales et d'orthographe sont observées dans l'article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Je suggère que les auteurs introduisent un tableau sur le Meta data sur les 3 station météorologiques utilisées et les 34 ans de pluviométrie : élévation, latitude, longitude, moyenne, écarts types etc...	
Il faut donner les références de ces 2 modèles utilisés dans l'étude CLimPACT2 master et WEAGETS.	
Comment expliques-tu le fait que la tendance des pluies observée est contraire à celles estimée ? Que pense tu de la performance du modèle ?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4

L'introduction est superficielle et manque des informations sur les études similaires en Afrique de l'Ouest et en Côte d'Ivoire et les modèles utilisés dans ces études. Il manque aussi le justificatif sur le choix des modèles que les auteurs ont utilisés dans la présente étude. Je suggère que les auteurs prennent en compte ces recommandations.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Les conclusions sont pertinentes et reflètent le contenu de cet article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
les références sont complètes et appropriées.	

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):

Le papier aborde le domaine de recherche lié au changement climatique de European Scientific Journal. Je pense que le journal cible est un forum approprié pour cet article. Le papier vise à analyser et modéliser les tendances pluviométriques extrêmes à l'horizon 2050 à partir des données pluviométriques journalières de 1980 à 2013. Je suggère une révision mineure. Si les auteurs abordent attentivement les commentaires (dans le manuscrit), je recommanderai la publication du manuscrit dans ESJ:

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: Saly SAMBOU	Email:
University/Country: Cheikh Anta Diop University	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: MODÉLISATION DES EXTRÊMES HYDROCLIMATIQUES DE LA RÉGION DE LA MARAHOUE (CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE) : APPORT DU MODÈLE WEAGETS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 28.09.2020	
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.	3
<p><i>The title is clear.</i></p> <p><i>But it is not well adapted to the content of the paper (see annotations in the text).</i></p> <p><i>The content of some paragraphs does not match with the subtitle.</i></p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>The abstract presents objects, methods and results. But it must be revised according to the corrections that will be made in the text.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Some errors have been noted (see annotations in the text).</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods need to be more explained in the methodology (see commentary in the text).</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>Some passages in the text are deserve reviewing (see annotations in the text).</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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):

The introduction is very short.

The problem must be clearly stated.

For each type of data used, a clear methodology must be presented beforehand.

Be more explicit so that readers can understand.