



**Paper: “Suivi De La Cinétique Du Développement Racinaire Des Plantes Destinées A La Stabilisation Des Talus Marneux De L’axe Autoroutier Fès-Taza (Nord Du Maroc)”**

Corresponding Author: Aicha Mouisat

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p287

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Naima Shaimi Inra/Morocco

Reviewer 2: Mokea Niaty Aurelien, Gabon

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: NAIMA SHAIMI	Email: shaimi_naima@yahoo.fr
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Suivi de la cinétique du développement racinaire des plantes destinées à la stabilisation des talus marneux de l'axe autoroutier Fès-Taza (Nord du Maroc) Kinetics monitoring of root development of some plant species used for soil stabilization in the embankments of the Fez-Taza highway (North of Morocco).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0751/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>the title is clear and reflects the content of the text</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract is divided on several parts, problematic of study, objective, material and methods, results and conclusion</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are few grammatical errors</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Some parameters in material and methods must be more detailed to allow readers better understand</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Yes the body of the paper is clear without errors</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusion summarizes perfectly the content of the paper</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**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: MOKEA-NIATY Aurélien	Email: amokeaniaty@yahoo.fr
University/Country: Gabon	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Suivi de la cinétique du développement racinaire des plantes destinées à la stabilisation des talus marneux de l'axe autoroutier Fès-Taza (Nord du Maroc)	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Le titre est très bien présenté)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Le résumé présente bien les objectifs, mais la présentation de la méthode et des résultats doivent être ajustés selon les recommandations apportées sur le manuscrit)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Le document est très bien écrit, il y a peu de fautes grammaticales)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Il y a un problème au niveau de la présentation de la méthodologie. L'auteur doit décrire les différentes méthodes ayant permis d'obtenir les résultats. J'ai apporté des suggestions à ce sujet dans le manuscrit.)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(L'ensemble du manuscrit mérite d'être revu, particulièrement au niveau de la méthodologie mais également au niveau de l'ensemble des résultats et de la discussion. J'ai apporté des suggestions à but constructives à sujet dans le manuscrit.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(La conclusion doit être ajustée selon mes recommandations apportées sur ce manuscrit)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(En tenant compte des modifications à apporter, les références doivent être ajustées.)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Le sujet abordé dans cet article est très important d'autant plus qu'il met l'accent sur la phytostabilisation des sols marneux. Cependant, il existe quelques améliorations à apporter dans le manuscrit. Je vous propose une réorganisation au niveau de la partie Matériel et Méthodes mais aussi, au niveau de la partie Résultat et Discussion. Particulièrement au niveau des Résultats il y a une redondance d'informations. J'ai apporté quelques propositions constructives dans le manuscrit pour amélioration.  
Merci

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

