

Paper: “Etude Metallogenique du Prospect Aurifere de Woulo-Woulo (Zone d’Afema, Sud-est de la Cote d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 08 July 2022

Accepted: 12 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Allou Gnanzou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p121](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p121)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zie Ouattara

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: 17 09 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19 09 2022
Manuscript Title: ETUDE METALLOGENIQUE DU PROSPECT AURIFERE DE WOULO-WOULO (ZONE D'AFEMA, SUD EST DE LA COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.08.2022	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes
<i>Aféma, cisaillement, Husson, 1998 (au lieu de Housson), schistes arkosés, en majorité, la corrélation des données montre, dolomite (non dolomie), pyrite disséminée (non disséminé), la minéralisation est encaissée (non et encaissé), plusieurs minéralisations, la métarhyolite déformée et métamorphisée, Côte d'Ivoire</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
<i>L'établissement des sections mérite d'être expliqué.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Yes
<i>Coulibaly Y., Boiron (non Boi Ron), Goldfarb (non Gold Farb)</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):

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Thanks.**