

Paper: “**Caractérisation des déchets solides ménagers de Faladié**”

Submitted: 25 February 2021

Accepted: 10 November 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Oumar Bah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n39p77

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akmel Meless Siméon
Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Sagne Moumbe Joel
Dschang, Cameroon

Reviewer 3: Cherifatou Biaou
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Benin

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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!

Date Manuscript Received:03/03/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/03/21
Manuscript Title: Etude expérimentale sur la composition des déchets ménagers organiques de Faladié	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0320/21	
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.

<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.	1
<p><i>Le titre n'est pas précis.</i></p> <p><i>Proposition d'un autre titre : Caractérisation des déchets solides ménagers de Faladié</i></p>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>Le résumé ne présente pas clairement les objectif, méthode et résultats. Il doit être revu.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Le document contient quelques erreurs de formulation</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>La méthode n'est pas bien expliquée. Elle doit être complètement revue</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les resultats sont acceptables</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>La conclusion ne reflète pas l'objectif de l'étude. Elle est touffue.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>La reference n'est pas appropriée et ne respecte pas la norme APA recommandée par l'ESJ</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Le document n'est pas facile à lire. Le résumé n'est pas concis, la méthodologie n'est pas clairement expliquée, les résultats sont acceptables mais la conclusion n'est pas précise ;
2. L'introduction n'est pas bien écrite : elle ne présente pas l'argument et les recherches récentes liées au sujet de recherche ;
3. En général, le contenu du document est mal structuré et ne facilite pas sa lecture. De plus, le document est touffu ;
4. Il est souhaitable que le document respecte la structure normale d'un article à savoir : résumé, abstract, introduction, matériels et méthodes, résultat, discussion, conclusion. A cet effet, les auteurs peuvent consulter les articles déjà publiés ;
5. Le reste des commentaires figurent dans le manuscrit.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: Dr SAGNE MOUMBE Joel	
University/Country: Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Etude expérimentale sur la composition des déchets ménagers organiques de Faladié	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0320/21	
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.	2
Le titre proposé ne reflète pas le contenu de l'article. En effet l'article traite de la caractérisation et la quantification des déchets ménagers en général et le titre se réduit à la composition et à la fraction organique de ses déchets	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résultat ne ressort pas bien les principaux résultats de la recherche</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le texte doit être relu car il contient assez de fautes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Méthodologie à réorganiser suivant les propositions en commentaire</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats ne sont pas bien présentés. En matière de quantification des déchets, on débouche sur la production spécifique par habitant/jour</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Harmoniser la présentation de la bibliographie</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Cette étude porte sur la caractérisation et quantification des déchets ménagers. Plusieurs protocoles existent et l'étude ne mentionne pas lequel ou lesquels a/ont été utilisé pour l'étude expérimentale.

Les auteurs du manuscrit doivent s'approprier les termes en matière de gestion des déchets notamment dépôts intermédiaires au lieu de décharges intermédiaires.

Ils doivent revoir la présentation des résultats de leur recherche en s'inspirant des études similaires disponibles.

La discussion doit être refaite

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: AKMEL Meless Siméon	
University/Country: Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké-Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/06.21	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/07/21
Manuscript Title: Etude expérimentale sur la caractérisation des déchets solides ménagers de Faladié	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.03.21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

<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>	
Titre bien formulé	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Réorganiser le résumé	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Des fautes de forme	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Méthodologie à revoir	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Une reorganisation du travail s'impose	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Trop longue. Arevoir	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Mal présentée	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Voir correction

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: