



Paper: “Petrographic and Geochemical Characteristics of the Metabasites of the SASCA Domain (Yonaké, Mani- Béréby and Dehié Sectors), South-West Côte d'Ivoire”

Corresponding Author: Fossou Jean Kouadio

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p247

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Fatiha Hadach, Cadi Ayyad University

Reviewer 3: Gbele Ouattara, Institut National Polytechnique Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Inp-Hb), Yamoussoukro, Côte D'ivoire (Ivory Coast)

Published: 31.07.2020

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:	• Email
University/Country: Cadi Ayyad university	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Petrographic and Geochemical Characteristics of the Metabasites of the SASCA Domain (Yonaké, Mani- Béréby and Dehié Sectors), South-West Côte d'Ivoire.	
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> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<p>The title summarizes the content, but the title should be corrected as follows: Petrographic and geochemical characteristics of the metabasites of the SASCA domain (Yonaké, Mani-Béréby and Dehié Sectors), South-West Ivory Coast.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">KOUADIO Fossou Jean-Luc Hervé, HOUSSOU N'Guessan Nestor, ALLIALY Marc Ephrem, GNANZOU Allou, DJRO Sagbrou Chérubin.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Laboratory of Geology, Mineral and Energy Resources (LGRME), Faculty of Earth Science and</p>	

Mineral Resources, Félix HOUPHOUËT BOIGNY University, Abidjan-Cocody, Ivory Coast.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The summary is clear, (Max. 250 words) it must be remove, and the Word Cote d'ivoire By Ivory Coast in all parts of the article.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Names of universities should be translated to English (in methodology) for example: Université de Toulouse it's University of Toulouse	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
It is clear	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The results obtained are important But in some paragraphs avoid dubious and not informative sentences	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion clearly presents the results obtained in an understandable way	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The authors use recent references which is a good thing But some references are not well presented such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replacing the word 'al' in the reference list by mentioning authors names - Replacing the word "et" by "and" in the text and references - "&" by "and" - What does it mean?? 	

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): Interesting paper, with few corrections to do.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Gbele Ouattara	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Petrographic and Geochemical Characteristics of the Metabasites of the SASCA Domain (Yonaké, Mani-Béréby and Dehié Sectors), South-West Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49_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	
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
The title is quite clear and reflects the content of the manuscript	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Complete the abstract with a brief overview of the material and methodology	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are some grammatical mistakes. Re-read the document*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is well explained, as well as the material used	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
Some errors to correct	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The discussion and the conclusion reflect the work carried out	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are good and updated	

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):

Read the manuscript and correct any errors. The presentation of the bibliography must be in accordance with that of the journal. Certain remarks are made in the associated document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is of good quality and presents new results on the metabasites of south-west Côte d'Ivoire and the West African craton.