Paper: **"Assessment of the Potential for Greenhouse Gas Emission Mitigation by the Methanization of Slaughterhouse Waste in the District of Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)"**

Corresponding Author: Tiangoua Kone

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eric Mutie Musau

Reviewer 2:

ERIC MUTIE MUSAU

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: 2022-11-15 03:10 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, it is clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

* The abstract present objectives, methods and results. The authors start by commiting grammatical errors. The introduction patlet can be improved

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

Poor paragraph structure and a few grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

* Well explained

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

* The body contains a few errors. The author should have objectives as stand alone
The conclusion is accurate, those the author can add their voice by stating the advantage of each method and it's appropriateness

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*Ensure the list is comprehensive

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Reviewer Files

Dr. Kamagate Mahamadou

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: 2022-11-12 10:36 PM
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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.

*A good title, short and precise!

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*The abstract is very good but so long. It iis better to reduce it.

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

I correct them in the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*Yes, the methodologies are very well explained..

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

*Yes..

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

*Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*Yes!

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):

1) Reduce the abstract!

2) continue to improve the english!

3) take into account of my remarks!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Reviewer Files