

Manuscript: “**Etude comparative des performances des plateformes de compostage de Siteu et de Ngui à Dschang (Cameroun)**”

Submitted: 12 April 2021

Accepted: 11 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Ngahane Emilienne Laure

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p248

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hedible Sidonie Clarisse, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Gnon Baba, University of Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 3: Martel Pascale, Cefrepade – Insa, Lyon,France

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: HEDIBLE Sidonie Clarisse	
University/Country:	University of Abomey-Calavi/Benin
Date Manuscript Received: 14 april 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21 April 2021
Manuscript Title: Influence of waste characteristics and site size on composting performance: Case of the Siteu and Ngui platforms in Dschang-Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Article ESJ : 77.04.2021	
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
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

No author cited in the introduction; while normally, you should cite 3 to 4 authors in the introduction

In the abstract, the objective is to be formulated clearly; then the data collection methods should be highlighted.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

4

(Please insert your comments)

4. The study methods are explained clearly.

2

In terms of equipment and methods, this involves specifying the equipment and methods for collecting data in the field. At this level, it is not a question of specifying the methods used for composting. Also, the photos do not have their place there; we are not yet at the results phase.

This involves specifying the sampling technique used the techniques and tools for collecting data in the field, then the methods of processing the data.

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

4

But, we have the impression that the authors of this article worked in the Africompost-Dschang project and took the results to make an article. This led to confusion between the methods used for composting and the methods for collecting data in the field.

Relevant results, the tables presented are without sources, it will be necessary to frame the article in the presentation canvas of an article.

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.	3
<p>Insufficient; to complete. A discussion is missing in the text. The authors of this article did not compare their ideas with those of other authors. which has meant that many authors are not cited</p> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div>	

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):

Accepted, minor revision needed. Take into account the remarks and recommendations to improve the form of the document. Relevant results

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title : Influence des caractéristiques des déchets et de la taille des sites sur les performances de compostage : Cas des plateformes de Siteu et Nguì à Dschang (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0477/21	
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.	3
<i>The title of the article is not clear and adequate to the content of the article. Thus, we propose the following title: Comparative studies of the performance of Siteu and Nguì composting platforms in Dschang (Cameroon)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, the abstract presents the objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
<i>Yes, there is less grammar and spelling error in this article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the methods of this study are clearly explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results presented in the tables and figures are not commented on. Some figures (figures 5 and 8) are to be reproduced.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The summary and conclusion are accurate and supported by the content of the text. But the summary is too long.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references do not contain any published articles in the field. Moreover, the year of publication of one of the references is not mentioned.</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):

Authors are advised to focus on discussing the results obtained rather than their simple analyses. If possible, we would like them to reduce the number of photos in the manuscript.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: MARTEL Pascale	
University/Country: CEFREPADE – INSA Lyon - France	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/04/14	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/05/07
Manuscript Title: Influence des caractéristiques des déchets et de la taille des sites sur les performances de compostage : Cas des plateformes de Siteu et Ngui à Dschang (Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 77.04.2021	
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.	4
<i>Yes it is</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	2
<i>Most of the references doesn't appear in the text (only one), only one. And different documents are cited but not referenced.</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):

My remarks are in the text joined.