

Manuscript: “**Sites D’eau Sacrés Et Conservation De La Biodiversité : Cas Des Paysages D’eau De La Région De Ziguinchor (Sénégal)**”

Submitted: 29 September 2021

Accepted: 13 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Barnabe Ephrem Dieme

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p18

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N’guessan Tenguel Sosthene

Reviewer 2: Monica Labonia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-09-23 12:39 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

yes

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

oui, il est approprié.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Il reste à mentionner les méthodes et les résultats.

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

Il faut revoir le style et la forme.

Eviter des jugements de valeurs.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthode est pertinente.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Il y a quelques erreurs. Il manque la problématique et une réflexion approfondie de la relation entre religion et préservation de l'environnement.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Très courte, il faut annoncer quelques perspectives d'étude.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Il reste à citer certains auteurs mentionnés dans le corpus du texte.

Les références doivent correspondre au matériel cité.

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-08-06 09:24 AM

Recommendation: See Comments

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

yes

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper.

You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Le titre est clair et expressif. Toutefois quelques mots méritent d'être supprimés dans sa formulation

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé s'attarde un peu trop sur le contexte de l'étude et présente moins sur la méthode de collecte de données ainsi que sur les résultats.

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

Il existe quelques fautes d'orthographe et grammaticales dont certaines ont été déjà intégrées au texte. Une lecture minutieuse ou par les pairs facilitera les éventuelles fautes. Le style d'écriture reste assez digeste et permet de suivre les auteurs avec un certain plaisir.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La démarche méthodologique est à revoir à certains endroits comme le contenu notionnel de "personne d'un certain âge", l'utilisation des techniques d'enquête et de collecte de données. Les observations intégrées dans le corps du texte et les commentaires aideront à affiner cette démarche.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Le texte est assez descriptif et analytique. Bien qu'il comporte quelques coquilles, cela n'entache nullement la qualité du travail. On retrouve toutefois des éléments de résultats dans la discussion que les auteurs voudront volontiers les extraire.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Pas de commentaire

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Pas de commentaire

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):