

Paper: **“Influence Physico-Chimique des Eaux d’Irrigation sur les Terrains Maraîchers des Niayes : Cas du Gandiolais”**

Submitted: 03 August 2023

Accepted: 18 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Mar Gaye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p26

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abderrahim Abouzaid

Centre Régional des Métiers de l’Education et de la Formation Casablanca, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Sy Amadou Abou

Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar, Senegal

Reviewer 3: Brahim Kone

Université Felix Houphouët-Boigny, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Boubou Aldiouma Sy

University Gaston Berger, Senegal

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: Prof. Amadou Abou SY	
University/Country: Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar (Senegal)	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 aout 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 septembre 2023
Manuscript Title: Suivi de la variabilité spatio-temporelle des propriétés physico-chimiques des eaux d'irrigation et des terrains agricoles dans les Niayes du Gandiolais	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---01.---26.08.2023---	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Voir dans le texte la suggestion de reformulation du titre et sa précision	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'objectif est assez Claire, la méthodologie également. Les résultats doivent être davantage plus synthétique	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques erreurs faciles à corriger et des reformulations à faire	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est Claire, des efforts de synthèse à faire	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont présentés mais avec trop de détails	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion reflète le contenu du texte mais manque de perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> A selon les normes de la revue	

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):

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: Noureddine EL BARAKA	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Suivi de la variabilité spatio-temporelle des propriétés physico-chimiques des eaux d'irrigation et terrains agricoles des Niayes du Gandiolais	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0826/23	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The title is clear and indicates that the study focuses on monitoring the spatio-temporal variability of the physicochemical properties of irrigation water and agricultural fields in the Niayes region of Gandiol.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The style of the abstract is clear overall, but could benefit from a slight revision to improve fluency and comprehension.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> In terms of grammar and spelling, the text is of good quality.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It presents results clearly and precisely, describing variations in the physico-chemical parameters of irrigation water and morpho-pedological formations in the Gandiolais region.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> needs more effort from an objective point of view expected	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> References must follow a specific format to ensure consistency and accuracy. It is also better to give references recently published.	

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):

Here is a brief summary of my comments:

The structure of the text is disorganized and needs better organization into clear sections.

There are grammatical and spelling errors that need to be corrected.

The use of appropriate tables, graphs and quotations will improve the presentation of data.

Some specialized terminology should be explained to make the text more accessible.

Include a clear summary of the results and their significance.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is better to give references recently published.

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: Boubou Aldiouma SY	
University/Country: University Gaston Berger/Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 September 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: le 09 October 2023
Manuscript Title: Suivi de la variabilité spatio-temporelle des propriétés physico-chimiques des eaux d'irrigation et terrains agricoles des <i>Niayes</i> du Gandiolais	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 26 08 2023	
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.	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Oui, 5 points	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Oui, 5 points	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Quelques erreurs de styles, c'est très bon dans l'ensemble, 5 points	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
L'approche methodologique est correcte, en phase avec l'objet de la recherche, 5 points	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les résultats sont corrects dans l'ensemble, 5 points	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le texte est correct est en phase avec l'actualité.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les références bibliographiques sont pertinentes.	

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):

Lire attentivement les observations en couleur dans le texte avant de valider

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Rien

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: 31/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/09/2023
Manuscript Title : Suivi de la variabilité spatio-temporelle des propriétés physico-chimiques des eaux d'irrigation et terrains agricoles des Niayes du Gandiolais.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0826/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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 clair et il présente bien le travail des auteurs.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Le résumé est Claire au niveau de la problématique élaborée par les auteurs et présente les méthodes utilisées ainsi que l'essentiel des résultats.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le style du texte est Claire, exempt de fautes grammatique major et moins d'erreurs d'orthographe avec quelques erreurs mineures.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Les méthodes d'étude sont clairement expliquées, je suggère aux auteurs d'identifier les caractéristiques et la traçabilité des instruments de mesure en l'occurrence le PH-mètre et le conductimètre pour plus d'information et de fiabilité des résultats.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Les résultats sont clairs et ne contiennent pas d'erreurs, je suggère que les sous titrages des cartes et des figures soient situés en dessous selon les normes de rédaction des articles.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Les conclusions sont compatibles avec le contenu et renforcées par des études antérieures présentées dans l'article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références sont complètes et appropriées. Je vous suggère d'essayer d'ajouter de nouvelles références récentes car la nouvelle version dans l'article date depuis 2017.</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):

Je tiens à féliciter les auteurs de l'excellent travail qui ont mené, cependant pour une meilleure présentation et mis en valeur du travail réalisé, je suggéré d'essayer d'améliorer les points suivants :

- Introduction à enrichir avec des données relatives aux problèmes environnementaux qui peuvent être causés ou liés au problème décrit dans l'article,
- La description de la zone d'étude doit figurer dans la section des méthodes,
- Ajouter plus d'informations sur les matériaux utilisés (pH, GPS et conductivité),
- Références à consolider avec d'autres références récentes,
- Faire une comparaison avec d'autres études qui ont été réalisées dans le même concept.