

Paper: “Evaluation de la Vulnérabilité des Nappes Phréatiques à la Pollution engendrée par la Mauvaise Gestion des boues de Vidange dans la Ville d’Aného au Togo”

Submitted: 10 January 2022

Accepted: 02 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Poromna Hezou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p208](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p208)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdellah El Hmaidi
Moulay Ismail University, Meknes, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Abdellah EL HMAIDI	
University/Country: Moulay Ismail University, Meknes, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 January 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 January 2022
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la vulnérabilité des nappes phréatiques à la pollution engendrée par la mauvaise gestion des boues de vidange dans la ville d'Aného au Togo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 59.01.2022-Manuscrit or 0159/22	
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Il faut citer quelques références relatives au journal ESJ : European Scientific Journal</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Toutes les recommandations sont en rouges dans le texte. *Il faut citer quelques références relatives au journal ESJ : European Scientific Journal*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Manuscrit bien rédigé avec beaucoup de données fort intéressantes. Les figures demandent une attention particulière pour les améliorer. Les résultats physico-chimiques demandent plus d'interprétation.