

Paper: "Reconstitution Paléoenvironnementale des Formations Maastrichtiennes, Cénomaniennes et Albiennes Basée sur les Données Sédimentologiques et Ichnologiques Issues des Carottes du Puits FIM-1X dans le Bassin Sédimentaire Offshore de la Cote d'Ivoire"

Submitted: 15 June 2021 Accepted: 08 June 2022 Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Isaac Fea

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p292

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raoul Étongué Mayer Université Laurentienne, Canada

Reviewer 2: Guede Koré Elysée Université de Man, Cote d'Ivoire

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

the title should be improved according to this form: "RECONSTITUTION PALEOENVIRONNEMENTALE BASEE SUR LES DONNEES SEDIMENTOLOGIQUES ET ICHNOLOGIQUES DES FORMATIONS MAASTRICHTIENNES, CENOMANIENNES ET ALBIENNES DU PUITS FIM-1X, BASSIN SEDIMENTAIRE OFFSHORE DE COTE D'IVOIRE." or "PALEOENVIRONMENTAL RECONSTITUTION BASED ON SEDIMENTOLOGICAL AND ICHNOLOGICAL DATA FROM MAASTRICHTIAN, CENOMANIAN AND ALBIAN FORMATIONS OF FIM-1X WELL, OFFSHORE SEDIMENTARY BASIN OF COTE D'IVOIRE."

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

the summary is well presented but a slight reformulation of the first paragraph was necessary.

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

There are not enough grammar and spelling mistakes in this article.

#### The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are clearly explained

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

The body of the document is coherent and clear. Few errors were found.

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

The summary and CONCLUSION effectively reflects the content of the article.

#### The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is complete but does not follow the APA citation style. The references are mostly old.

#### Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

```
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
```

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

## Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

# Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

# Please rate the BODY of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

4

# Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

4

# Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

# Accepted, minor revision needed **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** the authors must take into account the various remarks recorded in the document. Reviewer H: Recommendation: Accept Submission The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. Absolutly. The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results. I made some changes see attached document. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Yes. See attached document. The study METHODS are explained clearly. Absolutly. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. The body of the paper is very clear in spite of minor errors. The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content. The conclusion is sound.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I agree. Nevertheless, must comply with EJS instructions.

**Overall Recommendation!!!** 

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
```

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed
Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
See infranotes.