Paper: **"Qualité Biologique de l'Eau de Consommation et MalAdaptabilités Biologiques chez des Enfants de 6 à 59 Mois de Milieux Socio-Sanitaires Différents"**

Corresponding Author: N'guessan Pazé Kouamé

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amal Talib Al Sa'ady
Babylon University, Iraq

Reviewer 2:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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: december, 30ᵗʰ 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: January 10ᵗʰ 2023
Manuscript Title: "Biological quality of drinking water and biological maladaptability in the chidren aged 6 to 59 months from different socio-sanitary backgrounds"	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 46547-1	
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/No 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**

(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) There are some errors of form with a few typos to correct	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) Methodology is very well written and adapted to the type of research.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) The results are very interesting with sharp analyses in the field of research	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

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]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):