

Paper: “Variabilité des Écoulements dans un Bassin Versant Forestier en Voie d’Urbanisation Accélérée : Le Cas de la Mefou (Sud Cameroun)”

Submitted: 27 April 2023

Accepted: 14 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Mewassi Aboui E.M.Salvador

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n17p34

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adama Ilboudo
Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Melaine Mel
Félix Houphouet-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Expédit Wilfrid Vissin
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

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!

Reviewer Name: VISSIN Expédit Wilfrid	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi/ Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 Mai 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 juin 2023
Manuscript Title: Variabilité des écoulements dans un bassin versant forestier en voie d'urbanisation accélérée : le cas de la Mefou (Sud Cameroun) Variability of flows in a forest catchment area in the process of accelerated urbanization: the case of Mefou (South Cameroon)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1	
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/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It will be necessary to take into account the observations written on the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name: MEL Mélédje Mélaine	
University/Country: Félix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 01 / 05 / 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 05 / 06 / 2023
Manuscript Title: Variabilité des écoulements dans un bassin versant forestier en voie d'urbanisation accélérée : le cas de la Mefou (Sud Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12.05.2023 (2)	
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.	4

<i>(Le titre est relativement clair. C'est une étude de géographie physique qui se penche sur l'évolution des écoulements dans un bassin versant, celui de la mefou)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Le résumé respect en termes de forme et de fond la logique de structuration. Je trouve juste que les résultats présentés ne sont pas synthétisés.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Les auteurs ont fait un effort de rélecture. Ce qui à mon sens a réduit le fautes dans la mouture finale.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(La procedure de collecte de données est clairement menée. Outre les bases spatiales et livresques, une observation du terrain a été actée.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Les résultats présentent des pistes pour expliquer le niveau de variation de l'écoulement du bassin versant.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(La conclusion synthétise les résultats de l'étude.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(C'est un peu le maillon faible du document. Tel que présenté, le focus sur les références pose souci. Les auteurs sont amenés à le revoir.)</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):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS

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!

Reviewer Name:	
University/Country: Université Joseph KI-ZERBO /Burkina Faso	
12/05/2023	04/06/2023
Manuscript Title: Variabilité des écoulements dans un bassin versant forestier en voie d’urbanisation accélérée : le cas de la Mefou (Sud Cameroun	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0512/23	
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
The title is clear and the developed content corresponds	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The summary presented the objectives and results. However, the methods should be further developed	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Explanations on the methods are provided and clear	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are well presented and clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The summary and conclusion are well supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
References are not appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/> +
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: