

Paper: “Evaluation de la qualité de l’eau du lac Azili et risques sanitaires associés à sa consommation dans le village lacustre d’Agonvè (commune de Zagnanado, Sud Bénin)”

Submitted: 15 March 2024

Accepted: 26 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Atchichoe Wilfrid

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p233](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p233)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hassan Lemacha
Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Pr. Hassan LEMACHA	
University/Country: Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 17-04-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 30-04-2024
Manuscript Title: EVALUATION DE LA QUALITÉ DE L'EAU DU LAC AZILI ET RISQUES SANITAIRES ASSOCIÉS À SA CONSOMMATION DANS LE QUATRIÈME ARRONDISSEMENT DE LA COMMUNE DE ZAGNANADO (SUD BÉNIN)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0355/24	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

1. Des corrections sont marquées en rouge et bleu ;
2. Numéroté l'équation 1;
3. La partie "**2.1.3 Caractéristiques bactériologiques de l'eau du lac Azili**" rédigez le texte avant la planche 3;
4. La liste bibliographique est incomplète (des références dans le texte ne figurant pas sur la liste);
5. Ajoutez des références récentes pour améliorer la qualité du travail (2022, 2023, 2024) ;

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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 18/045/2024	Manuscript Received:	Date 28/05/2024	Review Report	Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la qualité de l'eau du lac Azili et risques sanitaires associés à sa consommation dans le quatrième arrondissement de la commune de Zagnanado (Sud Bénin)				
ESJ Manuscript Number:				
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:				
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>The title was well formulated and highlighted the relevance of the subject.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The writing methodology was very good, and the different stages in the writing process were mentioned.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There aren't many grammatical errors, just as there aren't many spelling mistakes. All in all, it's very appreciable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Very good</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Exceptional</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Very good</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Add authors to increase the reference</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): That the suggestions and recommendations that have been evaluated are included.