



Paper: “Caractérisation Hydrodynamique et Qualité des eaux de l’aquifère à nappe libre du bassin versant du Nkié (Yaoundé–Cameroun)”

Corresponding Author: Abdou Nasser Ngouh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n15p281

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Karim HILMI, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: TOE-BI KahouKatel Kizito, Côte d’Ivoire

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Karim HILMI	Email:
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 05 th May 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07 th May 2020
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation Hydrodynamique et Qualité des eaux de l'aquifère à nappe libre du bassin versant du Nkié (Yaoundé-Cameroun) Hydrodynamic Characterization and Water Quality of the Aquifer of the Nkié Watershed (Yaoundé-Cameroon)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 57.05.2020	
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: Yes (only for ESJ review)	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes (only for ESJ review)	

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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<p>The title of the paper refers to hydrodynamic aspect while it is not treated in this paper. So it is proposed to remove the term hydrodynamic from the title and also in the body's text.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Too long versions in the abstract either in english and in french. The authors must respect the length and the number of words following the instructions of authors of the review. English version must be revisited and rewritten in a "good "english".</p> <p>In the french abstract version and in the text, there is no need for precision about the days. Just mention the months</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Yes spelling mistakes exist in the text which must be revisited for the final version</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The figure 2 must be presented in the results section. Just refer in the Material & Methods section the use of these meteorological data</p> <p>Some terms must be modified in the body's text: for example the collecting data use the term "collecté" instead "fait" and for the analysed data use the term "réalisé" instead "fait"</p> <p>Put the term in situ <i>in italics</i></p> <p>References must be added to the equations which must be centralized in the body of the text ("au centre de la ligne").</p> <p>The numbering of the equations must follow a chronological order from the beginning of the text. In some sections the authors refer for example to I and II</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The arrangement of the tables and the figures is not conform to the body's text. Many tables and figures are placed in pages further from the quoted text. In principle, these tables and figures must be placed as possible on the same page of the quoted text, if not, to the limit of the next page..</p> <p>In page 15 the authors refer for discussion to some hydrographic bassins ("bassins hydrographiques") The countries must be mentioned.</p> <p>In page 22; the author refer to 2 references of OMS standarts (2004 and 2012). Which one used? Only 2012 is mentioned in the references.</p> <p>At any cases, these standarts (or "normes") OMS, used by the authors, must be specified by the authors in a table to be added in the body's text, so that the reader can compare easily these standarts to the results found by the authors.</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions must be revisited	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references seem to follow the instructions of authors of the review. A final checking must be done by the authors if is there any missing reference(s).	

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):

The requested revisions must be done by the authors for the final acceptance of the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

A second review must be done after resubmission of the revised version by the authors

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: TOE-BI Kahou Katel Kizito	Email:
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: :	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation Hydrodynamique et Qualité des eaux de l'aquifère à nappe libre du bassin versant du Nkié (Yaoundé-Cameroun)/ Hydrodynamic Characterization and Water Quality of the Aquifer of the Nkié Watershed (Yaoundé-Cameroon)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0557/20	
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
Yes, The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Yes, The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Yes, there are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Yes, The study methods are explained clearly. But methods granulometry are few explained</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes, the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

Congratulations for this article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

thank you for the consideration