

Paper: “Cartographie Automatique des Zones Inondées et Evaluation des Dommages dans le District d’Abidjan depuis Google Earth Engine”

Submitted: 30 September 2023

Accepted: 09 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Amandine Carine Njeugeut Mbiafeu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n32p54

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N'Gessan Fabrice Kouassi

Université Alassane Ouattara, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Bernadette Sabi Lolo

Université d'Aomey Calavi (UAC)

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: SABI LOLO ILOU Bernadette	
University/Country: Université d'Aomey Calavi (UAC)	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/10/23	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Cartographie automatique des zones inondées et évaluation des dommages dans le District d'Abidjan à l'aide de l'imagerie satellitaire radar sentinel-1 depuis Google Earth Engine	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17233	
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

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

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input checked="" 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:

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Le titre est clair et adéquat au contenu de l'article. Mais, le titre est assez long. L'aspect méthodologique ressort dans le titre. Je propose comme titre : « Cartographie automatique des zones inondées et évaluation des dommages dans le District d'Abidjan ».

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé ne respecte pas les normes de la revue. il est à reprendre.

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

Dans l'ensemble, l'article est bien rédigé. Cependant, des erreurs grammaticales et d'orthographe existent.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Les méthodes de l'étude sont clairement expliquées. Mais, le seuil de précision de la cartographie automatique des inondations n'est pas défini (marge d'erreur). De plus, les informations de terrains pour la validation des résultats de la télédétection ne figurent pas également.

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

Le corps du document est clair et mais contient des erreurs. Il s'agit de l'emploi des pronoms personnels (on, nous) qui ne sont pas autorisés. Il faut également revoir la police pour le texte. Il y'a plusieurs types d'apostrophes utilisés dans le texte.

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

La conclusion est bien fait. Par contre, elle doit être fait en bloc et non en paragraphes. Il faut également éviter les connecteurs logiques de développement (en effet).

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Les références sont à refaire en application du style bibliographique APA. Il existe des auteurs dans le texte mais absents dans la bibliographie. C'est le cas de (PAM, 2022) et bien d'autres auteurs

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]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
