

Manuscript: “**Modélisation Des Niveaux D’eau Extrêmes Sur Les Plages Sableuses De Malibu, De Gadaye Et De Malika (Dakar, Sénégal) Consécutives À La Tempête Du 19 Novembre 2018**”

**Submitted: 06 December 2021**

**Accepted: 24 January 2022**

**Published: 31 January 2022**

Corresponding Author: Cisse Cheikh Omar Tidjani

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n3p79](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n3p79)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Dr Amadou Abou SY, Université Cheikh Anta DIOP de Dakar (Sénégal)

# ***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: Dr Amadou Abou SY	
University/Country: Université Cheikh Anta DIOP de Dakar ( Sénégal)	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 janvire 2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Modélisation des niveaux d'eau extrêmes sur les plages sableuses de Malibu, de Gadaye et de Malika consécutive à la tempête du 19 novembre 2018 à Dakar</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61 12 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le titre peut etre amélioré. Mettre plus l'accent sur les impacts morphologiques de</i>	

<i>la tempête</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Moyen, la méthodologie peut être davantage plus précise</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>L'expression doit être améliorée</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>La méthodologie est assez détaillée mais il y'a bcp d'imprécision</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats sont assez sommaires sur les résultats des profils des plages</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>La conclusion est assez bien conduite</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références sont assez bien présentées</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**