

Paper: “Caracterisation et Renforcement des Proprietes Geotechniques des Briques de Terre avec Rajout de Paille de Riz”

Submitted: 12 August 2022

Accepted: 16 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Soumaila Bakayoko

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p55](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p55)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Agré Séraphin Djomo

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!

Reviewer Name: DJOMO Agré Séraphin	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé de Daloa	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: CARACTERISATION ET RENFORCEMENT DES PROPRIETES GEOTECHNIQUES DES BRIQUES DE TERRE AVEC RAJOUT DE PAILLE DE RIZ	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0738/21	
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.	3
<i>Le titre est clair, mais avec une petite modification. Je préfère remplacer géotechnique par mécanique dans le titre.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>Le résumé présente clairement les objets, les méthodes sont pas bien développées et les résultats sont pas bien expliqués, il ne fait qu'une analyse des résultats sans donner des explications.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>Il y a peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans cet article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>Les méthodes d'étude expliquées avec moins de détails sur la formulation des différents échantillons réalisés.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Les résultats ne contiennent pas d'erreurs</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Les conclusions ou le résumé sont exacts et étayés par le contenu.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références sont complètes et appropriées.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS

