

Paper: “Evaluation de la Translocation du Cadmium, du Cuivre, du Plomb et du Zinc par Zea mays L. cultivé Sur un Sol Ferrugineux Tropical dans l’Ouest du Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 02 February 2023

Accepted: 21 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Issaka Senou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n9p137

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Fousséni Gbadamassi
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Soumaila Bakayoko
Université Felix Houphouët Boigny de Cocody, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: GBADAMASSI Fousséni	
University/Country: Université de Parakou/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 2023/03/18	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la translocation du cadmium, du cuivre, du plomb et du zinc par Zea mays L. cultivé sur un sol ferrugineux tropical dans l'Ouest du Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33.02.2023	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<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.	3
<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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Est-ce que la concentration des métaux est homogène et égale dans tous les apports de déchet????

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: SOUMAILA BAKAYOKO	
University/Country: Université Felix Houphouët Boigny de Cocody	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/03/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la translocation du cadmium, du cuivre, du plomb et du zinc par <i>Zea mays</i> L. cultivé sur un sol ferrugineux tropical dans l'Ouest du Burkina Faso	
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>
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

Le titre est clair, précis et innovant	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Le résumé présente clairement les objets, les méthodes bien développées et les résultats sont bien expliqués</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Il y a peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans cet article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Les méthodes d'étude expliquées avec plus de détail</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats ne contiennent pas d'erreurs</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Les conclusions ou le résumé sont exacts et étayés par le contenu.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Les références sont complètes et appropriées.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

R A S

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

R A S