

Paper: “Résultats 2018-2021 de L’évolution Morphologique de la Baie de Bel Air (Presqu’île du Cap Vert): Quand les Pointes Rocheuses Jouent le Rôle D’épis Naturelles de Protection des Plages!”

Submitted: 26 September 2022

Accepted: 17 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Amadou Abou SY

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p190](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p190)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tape Bi Sehi Antoine

Reviewer 2: Cheikh Ahmed Tidiane Faye

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: 21/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/09/2022
Manuscript Title: Résultats 2018-2021 de l'évolution morphologique de la Baie de Bel Air (presqu'île du cap vert) : Quand les pointes rocheuses jouent le rôle d'épis naturelles de protection des plages!	
The 2018-2021 results of the morphological evolution of the Bay of Bel Air (Cape Verde peninsula): When the rocky points play the role of natural defense to protect the beaches!	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33.---54.09.2022	
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	
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>Très bon sujet au regard des contraintes auxquelles sont soumises les côtes africaines sous l'effet du changement climatique</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Les techniques et outils utilisés dans la réalisation de l'étude ne sont pas indiqués</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Très bon niveau de langue</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Très bonne démarche méthodologie</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Résultats acceptables au regard de la démarche scientifique</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Oui mais ils doivent être renforcés et améliorés</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références ne sont pas toutes indiquées. Dans le document, il y a plus 10 auteurs qui ont été référencés alors que dans la bibliographie, ils ne sont que 7.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Travail acceptable. Cependant, les insuffisances observées tout au long du document doivent être prises en compte afin d'améliorer le document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr Cheikh Ahmed Tidiane FAYE	
University/Country: Cheikh Anta Diop University/Sénégal	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/09/2022
Manuscript Title: Résultats 2018-2021 de l'évolution morphologique de la Baie de Bel Air (presqu'île du cap vert) : Quand les pointes rocheuses jouent le rôle d'épis naturelles de protection des plages !	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0954/22	
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.

<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>(Le titre est très clair et en parfait adéquation avec le contenu, il permet de diviser le texte en 2 parties. Une première sur le résultat de suivi de l'évolution morphologique et une seconde sur le rôle protecteur des pointes rocheuses)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(le résumé présente clairement l'objet de recherche, la méthodologie et une esquisse des résultats)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(il existe quelques fautes de grammaire: cf au texte)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(la méthodologie d'ensemble est bien exposée)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Les résultats sont bien clairs mais contiennent quelques erreurs de présentation. Cf à mes observations sur le texte)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Les conclusions et résumé sont en adéquation avec le contenu)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Les références bibliographiques sont pertinentes et actuelles par rapport au sujet et à la zone d'étude)</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):

Il faut présenter tous les 11 profils étudiés au lieu d'1 profils représentatifs par secteur. Il faut également présenter un MNT représentatif de la zone d'études pour mieux illustrer vos résultats qui du reste sont très pertinents et actuels.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Néant