

Paper: “Evaluation des Impacts Environnementaux et Sanitaires Liés aux Analyses Physico-Chimique et Bactériologique de la Rivière Matsiatra à Fianarantsoa, Madagascar”

Submitted: 05 October 2023

Accepted: 25 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Andry Harinaina Rabearisoa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p206

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Mohamed Chiban
Ibn Zohr University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Gnagne Agness Esoh Jean Eudes Yves
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Samson GUENNE	
University/Country: Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Évaluation des risques environnementaux et sanitaires liés à la qualité physico-chimique et bactériologique de la rivière Matsiatra à Fianarantsoa, Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1038/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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.	yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors must improve	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors must improve language	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	no
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	no
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusion must improve	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	yes
<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 type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: GNAGNE Agness Essoh Jean Eudes Yves	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received: 06-12-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-12-2023
Manuscript Title: Évaluation des risques environnementaux et sanitaires liés à la qualité physico-chimique et bactériologique de la rivière Matsiatra à Fianarantsoa, Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1038/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

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
Le thème n'est pas adéquat surtout le mot "risque" qui peut ramener à des calculs. Je trouve que impact est mieux.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
Le résumé n'est pas du tout Claire. La methodologie n'est pas bien étayé. Les caractéristiques des stations de prélèvement ne sont pas bien définies. Le nombre de campagne n'est pas précisé.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a énormément de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans l'article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La methodologie n'est pas claire	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont claires, mais l'ACP a été mal menée	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion et le résumé doivent être en accord avec le reste de l'article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> RAS	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'introduction est trop longue, la problématique n'est pas très claire. Certaines références dans le texte ne sont pas bien écrites. Concernant l'expression des résultats, il faut utiliser les tests de comparaison pour comparer les différentes valeurs des

paramètres. Comparer ces valeurs aux valeurs guides de l’OMS et Malagasy. Présenter bien la qualité de l’eau selon les DBO₅ obtenus en fonction de la grille de RODIER. L’ACP doit être bien réalisée en utilisant uniquement les trois sites et utiliser les valeurs moyennes pour réaliser l’ACP. La corrélation entre les facteurs et les paramètres doit être revu car les bonnes corrélations doivent se situer entre 0,5 et 1. Dans la discussion, il y a trop d’affirmation intéressante sans référence. Il faut trouver des références à ces affirmations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: