
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 06/11/2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Distribution et évolution des matières oxydables dans le secteur orientale de la lagune Ebrié (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 75.11.2017	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Je propose le titre suivant: Analyse saisonnière des matières oxydables dans la partie orientale de la lagune Ebrié (Côte d'Ivoire)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Il doit reprendre le résumé en respectant les règles: contexte, objectif, méthodologie, résultats et conclusion	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Pas trop de fautes de grammaires	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Il manque une analyse statistique appropriée pour traiter les données	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Certains paragraphes sont à reformuler ou à reprendre mais dans l'ensemble c'est acceptable	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Conclusion trop longue sans véritable details. Elle est à reprendre	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>Pas trop enrichi mais acceptable</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Au niveau de l'introduction la problématique n'apparaît pas clairement et l'objectif est énoncé plus haut. Il faut que les auteurs utilisent une méthode statistique appropriée pour traiter les données en présentant un tableau qui résume les paramètres statistiques élémentaires (Max, Min, Moyenne, Ecart-type, Ect...). De même, il faut qu'il évite certaines comparaisons qui ne sont pas forcément vraies lorsqu'on passe d'un milieu lagunaire à un autre.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I 'm very glad to be a reviewer in your journal. I hope, it will not be the end.

Best regards

