

Manuscript: “**Signature Gochimique des Granitoides de la Branche Est du Sillon de Boundiali-Korhogo (Nord de la Cote D’ivoire)**”

Submitted: 24 June 2021

Accepted: 20 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Inza Coulibaly

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p223

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adingra Martial Pohn Koffi, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Abdellah El Hmadi, Professor of Geosciences, Moulay Ismail University, Meknes, Morocco

Reviewer 5: Evens Emmanuel, University of Quisqueya, Haiti

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)

The title is adequate and clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract presents clearly objects, methods and results

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

(Please insert your comments)

There are very few grammatical errors in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The study methods are well explained.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of paper is clear and contain few errors.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion is accurate and show the principal results of the study.

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)

The list of references is comprehensive and update.

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):

The author must take the suggestions to improve the quality of paper.

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)

The title needs more clarification.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology needs to be more explained with the number of samples effectively used. The mineralogy of the rocks may be added.

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

(Please insert your comments)

I will attach my comments so that the authors will see the errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes but some details are missing; sample collection or field work, number of samples, laboratory of analyses

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The petrography of the study must be extended to the other rocks even if they have not been analysed.

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):

Thanks for this achievement

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

(Please insert your comments)

Yes but not so much.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the study METHODS are explained clearly.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain so many errors.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes, the conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

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):

The manuscript is well written. The results are interesting. Figures and tables are of good quality. The list of references remains very correct.

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)

The title is appropriate and clearly states the key features of this work.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is generally fair since it provides an overview of the background, justifying the need to conduct such research and presenting the most relevant results.

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

(Please insert your comments)

The article needs to be revised. Indeed, there are a few spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology of the study is well developed.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The article reflects a current state of knowledge with a sufficiently critical and internationally evaluated literature. The introduction states the topic of the research, explain clearly the main idea. The research question is outline and justified what is already known about the topic. The article reflects a current state of knowledge with a sufficiently critical and internationally evaluated literature.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusion presents specific knowledge and in terms of scientific literature, which may be used as the basis for future researches/reviews. The author gave a comprehensive view of the research hypothesis supported by their findings.

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)

It would be interesting, as it is becoming a new standard nowadays, for the authors to provide the DOIs of the articles cited and which are listed in the bibliographic references.

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):

The reviewer asks the authors to proofread the article to make some spelling corrections.