

**Paper: “First Physico-Chemical and Traditional Characterisation of Lake Tseny, Northwest Madagascar”**

**Submitted: 21 June 2023**

**Accepted: 16 September 2023**

**Published: 30 September 2023**

Corresponding Author: Randrianandrianina Félicien Herbert

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nat Quansah  
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Valentina Manoiu  
University of Bucharest, Romania

# 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: Nat Quansah	
University/Country: University of Antananarivo, Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: First physico-chemical and traditional characterisation of Lake Tseny, Northwest Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0716/23	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The title is clear and captures the contents of the research.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>The abstract is good but lacks some data pertaining to the results. These need to be incorporated to make it complete.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>Article is well written. The few grammatical errors should be easily rectified.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Very clear; the diverse methods employed during the research are well explained.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are clear, well presented in tabular and graphic forms however, some data are missing. These should be included to make it complete.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>Conclusions as well as recommendations are clear and provide information that contributes to the conservation of the lake.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>All 40 references are appropriate. All references cited in the text are also found in the reference section.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Comments and Suggestions are provided and indicated in the text.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

A useful contribution to this important area of conservation of aquatic resources and local traditions that help with the management of these resources. The authors only need to incorporate the minor suggestions and the article should be accepted for publication.

# 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: August 31, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: September 6, 2023
Manuscript Title: <b>First physico-chemical and traditional characterisation of Lake Tseny, Northwest Madagascar</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0716/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No <b>NO</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):  
Congratulations for the hard work!**