

Manuscript: “**Etude Chimique et Micro-Cartographique De Roches Carbonatées : Cas Des Calcaires Lumachelliques De l’Oligocène Inferieur Du Bassin Emergé de Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 13 October 2020

Accepted: 23 February 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Assalé Fori Yao Paul

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p52

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jolie Wanesse, Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Cocody, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Kouassi Kouamé Alfred, Assistant, Géologue marin, Département des Sciences de la terre, UFR Environnement, Université Jean Lorougnon Guedé, Daloa, Côte d’Ivoire

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: Douzo Jolie Wanesse Danielle	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Cocody Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/ 01 / 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Etude Chimique et Micro-Cartographique De Roches Carbonatées : Cas Des Calcaires Lumachelliques De l'Oligocène Inferieur Du Bassin Emergé Ivoirien	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 106.10.20	
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
<i>The title is clear and adequate of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The drafting of the summary is so good. It complied with the essential elements</i>	

<i>(objects, methods and results).</i>	
<i>However in the keywords I think that Silification should be replaced by carbonate rock or added to it</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Grammar and spelling mistakes in this article are rare</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Study methods are explained clearly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>The results are generally clear and not contain errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion or summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are complete and appropriate. but it is contacted that the references are very young. it should try to balance for a better analysis and discussion.</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):

- Numeroté les pages
- Faire une petite description de la stratigraphie en mettant l'accent sur les calcaires de la zone d'étude. Et par la suite continuer par la géochimie et la cartographie.
- Les résultats sont bons, exploiter encore plus avec une interprétation plus poussée.
- Les légendes (les planches et la stratigraphie) sont pas visible augmenter le caractère pour mieux lire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Le titre est bien clair et compréhensible

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Le résumé expose les objectifs, la méthodologie et les résultats

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Quelques fautes sont présentes dans le document que l'auteur pourra corriger après une lecture attentive.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

La méthode adoptée pour l'acquisition des résultats est bien expliquée

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Le corps du document est clair mais contient néanmoins quelques fautes que l'auteur peut corriger

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

La conclusion de l'article expose clairement de manière succincte les résultats

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Cette citation est présente aussi bien dans le document que dans la liste des références

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):