



Paper: “Analyse Par Approche Hydrogeochimique De La Distribution Spatiale De La Salinite Des Eaux De La Nappe Et Des Sables Quaternaires Du Secteur Des Niayes Du Gandiolais (Littoral Nord Senegalais)”

Corresponding Author: Souleymane Niang

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p104

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Dovonou E. Flavien, Uac/Bénin

Published: 31.08.2020

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: Dr. DOVONOU E. Flavien	Email:
University/Country: UAC/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 20 juillet 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 juillet 2020
Manuscript Title: ANALYSE PAR APPROCHE HYDROGEOCHIMIQUE DE LA DISTRIBUTION SPATIALE DE LA SALINITE DES EAUX DE LA NAPPE ET DES SABLES QUATERNAIRES DU SECTEUR DES NIAYES DU GANDIOLAIS (LITTORAL NORD SENEGALAIS)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1267/20	
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: <input type="checkbox"/> 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>il est très long et peut être un peu plus concis</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
On ne voit pas transparaître l'objet de l'étude.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Oui. Il ya des phrases mal formulées à revoir	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Acceptable	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Quelques fautes à corriger	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Acceptable	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Acceptable</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):

Le manuscrit est acceptable avec quelques corrections

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Le manuscrit est acceptable avec quelques corrections