

Manuscript: “**Archean Itabirites From Ovan, NE-Gabon: Petrography, Mineralogy And Elemental Mapping**”

Submitted: 26 May 2021

Accepted: 22 June 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Stévy Retonda-Kondja

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p380

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Wafik Amina, Faculte des Sciences Semlalia, Universite Cadi Ayyad, Departement de Geologie, Gueliz Marrakech, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Vladimir Zhmakin, Pensioner. Russia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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)

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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

(Please insert your comments)

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

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)

yes

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):

Some parts have to be developed :

what is the implication of elemental contents

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: Vladimir Zhmakin	
University/Country: Russia	
Date Manuscript Received: 10.06 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.06.2021
Manuscript Title: Archean Itabirites from Ovan, NE-Gabon: Petrography, Mineralogy and Elemental Mapping.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 14288	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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)</i> The mention of mapping is superfluous	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Corresponds to the content of the article	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The mapping process is unclear	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusions about the hydrothermal-volcanogenic source of iron in ferruginous quartzites are hasty and considered in isolation from the sources of quartz input and do not correspond to the widest distribution of ferruginous quartzites in a certain geological period	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> See point 5	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Take into account the comments in subsequent works.

