

Manuscript: “**Qualité Des Eaux De Boisson Conditionnées En Sachet Vendues Dans La Région De Dakar Au Sénégal**”

**Submitted: 27 August 2020**

**Accepted: 27 April 2021**

**Published: 30 June 2021**

Corresponding Author: Modou Dieng

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p104

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Seydou Niang, University Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar, Senegal

# ***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:	
Date Manuscript Received: /09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Qualité des eaux de boisson conditionnées en sachet vendues dans la région de Dakar au Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: No	
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>
Le titre cadre avec le contenu du manuscrit	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
Des améliorations sont nécessaires	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Pas suffisant	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
Pas suffisant	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
En dessous du moyen	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
A revoir	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
A revoir	

**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):**

Les travaux portant sur la qualité des eaux de boisson sont importants puisqu'il s'agit souvent d'attirer l'attention des décideurs sur les potentiels dangers auxquels les populations sont exposées.

Les données collectées dans le cadre du travail sont assez pour avoir une idée claire de la situation dans ces marchés de Dakar. Cependant une analyse approfondie est requise. Les auteurs ont un sérieux travail de fond ainsi que de forme à faire. Il urge de prendre son temps pour produire un manuscrit de qualité pour véritablement apporter un plus non seulement à la science mais aussi au dakarois dont la santé est menacée.

# ***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: Seydou NIANG	Email:
University/Country: University Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar, Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 <sup>th</sup> March 2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Quality of packaged beverage waters sold in Senegal, Dakar region</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0936/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study is focused on 5 markets in Dakar area, the title would be clear if this had been stated in the title	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There is a standard for drinking raised in the abstract, but there is any reference related to that one	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See the manuscript review	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some questions raised (see the manuscript review)	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See manuscript review	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See manuscript review	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

Please see manuscript Review