

Manuscript: “**Estimation Des Concentrations Et Cartographie De La Dynamique Des Polluants Atmosperiques Particulaires Dans La Ville D’abidjan**”

Submitted: 24 July 2021

Accepted: 14 October 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Vami Hermann

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p116

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: ADJAKPA Tchékpo Théodore, University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

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: ADJAKPA Tchékpo Théodore	
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: November 11, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: December 1, 2021
Manuscript Title: ESTIMATION DES CONCENTRATIONS ET CARTOGRAPHIE DE LA DYNAMIQUE DES POLLUANTS ATMOSPHERIQUES PARTICULAIRES PM_{2.5} DANS LA VILLE D'ABIDJAN : APPORT DE L'IMAGERIE SATELLITAIRE LANDSAT8	
ESJ Manuscript Number: D/M/2021	
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.	5
<i>(1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

The abstract is clear. But some precision must be made	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article which must be corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, the methods used are cleared</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes the results are clear but it contains some errors which are related in the manuscript and needed to be corrected.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes the conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. But the summary need some precision that has been related.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate but some authors are been omitted and it needed to be corrected as indicate by the corrector</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):

The bibliographies' references of this article must to be completed seriously with the authors which are been omitted.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: