

Manuscript: **“Inventaire Et Évaluation Scientifique Des Géosites Des Falaises De Fresco En Côte d’Ivoire”**

Submitted: 20 March 2021

Accepted: 21 June 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Wrohou Bénédicte Dibo

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p150

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zerhouni Youssef, Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: ZERHOUNI Youssef | |
| University/Country: Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 10 / 06/ 2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 15/ 06 /2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Les géosites des falaises de Fresco (Côte d'Ivoire) : Inventaire et évaluation scientifique | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 14079-Article Text-41891-1-4-20210319 | |
| 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. | 3 |
| <i>Titre à revoir. Il nécessite une légère amélioration</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Le résumé regroupe les points essentiels abordés dans le manuscrit. Il est correctement rédigé, clair et concis et reflète fidèlement les grandes idées du texte.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>Peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans le texte.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>La méthodologie semble être adéquate et très convainquante.</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>Pas d'erreurs soulevées dans les résultats qui sont correctement exposés.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>Les interprétations et conclusions sont cohérentes avec la méthodologie et les objectifs assignés.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>Les références bibliographiques, au nombre de 31, sont complètes et correctement exposées.</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 texte est à revoir dans certains points et il y a des corrections à faire (En rouge dans le texte)