

Manuscript: **"Evaluation Des Polluants Emergents (Parabènes, Triclosan Et Triclocarban) Dans Les Baies D'Azito, Du Banco Et De Marcory (Abidjan, Côte D'Ivoire)**"

Submitted: 21 May 2021 Accepted: 12 October 2021 Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Kouamé Kouakou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p297

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Gnamien Konan Bah Modeste, Universite Jean Lorougnon Guede – Daloa Cote D'ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

**Reviewer 3**: YAPI Dopé Armel, Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa (Côte d'Ivoire)

### **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: GNAMIEN KONAN BAH MODESTE

University/Country: UNIVERSITE JEAN LOROUGNON GUEDE - DALOA COTE D'IVOIRE

Date Manuscript Received: 16/09/2021 Date Review Report Submitted: 22/09/2021

Manuscript Title: Evaluation Des Polluants Emergents (Parabènes, Triclosan Et Triclocarban) Dans Les Baies D'Azito, Du Banco Et De Marcory (Abidjan)

ESJ Manuscript Number: 0978/21

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 published version 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.

| Questions   | Rating Result<br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4  |
| Le titre est Claire et reflète le contenu de l'article                  |  |

| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.  | 2 |  |
|---|---|--|
| Le résumé énonce clairement les résultats mais ne mentionne pas les objectifs et la méthodologie.   |   |  |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.  | 3 |  |
| Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres.  |   |  |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly.   | 4 |  |
| A ce niveau, certains ajustements sont à faire : Il y a lieu de mentionner le cadre disciplinaire dans lequel se situe l'étude et justifier le choix des sites d'étude. |   |  |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.  | 3 |  |
| Le cadre méthodologique est bien détaillé mais la démarche de sélection des des points d'échantillonnage doit être mieux expliquée.                                     |   |  |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.  |   |  |
| La conclusion et le résumé reprennent fidèlement le contenu.  |   |  |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.  | 3 |  |
| Les références sont compréhensives et appropriées   |   |  |

#### **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):**

J'encourage les auteurs à prendre en compte toutes ses observations pour améliorer davantage le document.

## **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: YAPI Dopé Armel  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa (Côte d'Ivoire)   |  |  |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 18/09/2021  | Date Review Report Submitted: 23/09/2021 |  |  |
| Manuscript Title: Evaluation Des Polluants Emergents (Parabènes, Triclosan Et Triclocarban) Dans<br>Les Baies D'Azito, Du Banco Et De Marcory (Abidjan) |  |  |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 78.09.2021   |  |  |  |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

# Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| Questions  | Rating Result<br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1.</b> The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3  |
| (Please insert your comments)  | ·  |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.                 | 2  |
| (Please insert your comments)  |  |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.     | 2  |
| (Please insert your comments)  |  |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly.                                    | 2  |

| (Please insert your comments)  |   |
|--|---|
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.                      | 2 |
| (Please insert your comments)  |   |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 2 |
| (Please insert your comments)  |   |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.                     | 1 |
| (Please insert your comments)  |   |
|  |   |

EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL Dy European Scientific Institute

