

**Paper: “Contribution à la Caractérisation des Sédiments Superficiels
Quaternaires de la Partie Sud du Marais Poitevin (Poitou-Charentes-France)”**

Submitted: 03 October 2022

Accepted: 08 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Braphond Rodrigue Vincent Benjamin Anongba

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p211](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p211)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Timothée Miyouna

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Timothée Miyouna

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: 2022-11-13 03:49 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 title is clear and adequate to the content of the manuscript**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

Yes there are some errors and mistakes in this manuscript. They should be corrected by the author

French version is clear, but must be improved. On the other hand, the English version must be completely reworked by a native English-speaker.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are very clear and are explained clearly

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

*** The body is clear, but the author must separate the discussion from the presentation of the results. The discussion part must appear clearly in the manuscript.**

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

*

The conclusion is acceptable, but, it must be improved. The conclusion must contained only the main results of the work

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):

I suggest that the author take into account the observations I made in the manuscript.

It must separate the discussion from the presentation of the results.

the author must endeavor to present only in the conclusion the main results obtained

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This work is of high quality and can be published after correction.