Corresponding Author: Kouadio Aya Nelly Berthe

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

Distribution spatio-temporelle du phytoplancton du système lagunaire Adjin-Potou (Côte D'Ivoire) : This title is clear and link to the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents the objectives to assess the composition of a water system and it evolution over four months during a year. Methods used and main results obtained are presented.

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

Very tiny grammatical errors and spelling mistaked identifies.
L24 : Afin de de gérer
L22 : plus grads nombres
L225 : les Chlorophyta

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are explained but some need to be referenced :

. Les échantillons prélevés à chaque station sont recueillis dans des piluliers de 100 mL, puis fixés avec du formol à 5 % pour les analyses au laboratoire.

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

The body of the body is correct, expect it does not contain statistical method uses. Need to add it prior publication.

Minor error in numbers of taxon

Table 1 :
La somme n'est pas 43 mais 42 à revoir. (St 8)
La sommes n'est pas 44 mais il y a 45 "+" dans la colonne (st9)

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

The conclusion is accurate but need to be enriched to show is socio-ecological and probably economic relevant.

No open research is mentioned at the end of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Leclercq et Maquet,(1987). missing in the reference
(Pearl et Millie, 1996). missing in the reference

I strongly encourage the authors to use an automatic reference manager software before submitting their paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

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, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This research is of an important interest for ensuring that people living a urban city will have safe water for drinking the incoming years. You carried out sampling on a large range of months.

The paper need to have more audience and contribute to ring the alarm bell on possible pollution which may occurred in the region. Futher research on rate of pollution could be carried out and with be of a great interest.

The statistical methods are notre presented. You mentioned a p-value and class for means but you did not mention which statistical tests were carry out.

Minor errors are identified at the bottom of your table 1.

The season of August is not clear, it either a small rainy season in the methodological chapter (L155- L158 : en janvier, juin, août et novembre de l'année 2013, correspondant respectivement à la grande saison sèche, la grande saison des pluies, la petite saison des pluies et à la petite saison sèche. , or a small dry season (L423 : petite saison sèche (août))

You should also ensure that the low richness observed is not due to a sampling effort.

Reviewer T:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear and informative. Similar studies have already been conductedSimilar studies have already been conducted.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is succinct and acceptable, but the results are not clearly distinguished from the problem

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

There's little fault

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is good but you don't feel the chronology of the objectives

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

The body of the document is well developed

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

The conclusion is very short but does not trace the salient results

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are good but we should respect the form of the journal just with the symbol before the last author

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author has written well apart from a few revisions. It applies to form and content and may well improve