

Manuscript: “**Evaluation Des Teneurs En Eléments Traces Métalliques (Cadmium Et Plomb) Dans L’eau, Les Sédiments Et Deux Espèces De Poissons Clarias gariepinus (Burchell, 1822) Et Oreochromis niloticus (Linné, 1758) Dans Le Pool Malebo (Fleuve Congo), RD Congo**”

Submitted: 23 February 2021

Accepted: 26 April 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Willy Lusasi Swana

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p174

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dovonou Edia Flavien, Univesité d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: DOVONOU Edia Flavien	
University/Country: Univesité d’Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 23 juin 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 juin 2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation des Teneurs en Eléments Traces Métalliques (Cadmium et Plomb) dans l’eau, les sédiments et deux espèces de poissons Clarias gariepinus (Burchell, 1822) Et Oreochromis niloticus (Linné, 1758) dans Le Pool Malebo (fleuve Congo), RD Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0316/21	
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>(Please insert your comments) Il faut juste bien écrire les Eléments Traces Métalliques</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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): Bien vouloir tenir compte des corrections et relire le manuscrit pour corriger certaines fautes