

Paper: “Caracterisaion Sedimentologique et Lithostratigiraphique de Deux Puits de la Zone d’Eboinda, Sud-est de la Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 04 August 2022

Accepted: 13 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Kouadio Cyrille YAO

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p144

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: TOE-BI Kahou Katel Kizito

Reviewer 2: Assalé Yao Fori

Assalé Yao Fori

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-11-04 03:43 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

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

*** Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** Oui**

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

Oui, l'auteur devra prendre les quelques remarques en compte qui sont mentionnées dans son article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*Oui

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

* **Il y quelques erreurs qu'ils devront corriger**

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

* **Oui**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

***Oui**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

TOE-BI Kahou Katel Kizito

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-11-04 03:43 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

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

* yes, The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

* yes, The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results

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

no grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

* yes, The study METHODS are explained clearly.

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

* **The body of the paper is clear and contain few errors**

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

* **yes, The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

* **yes, The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

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

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):