

Paper: “Caracterisation Geochimique des Deblais du Substratum de la Baie du Banco, Abidjan, Basse Cote d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 19 October 2023

Accepted: 05 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Yao Diby Ferdinand

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p124](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p124)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: A. Wahid Sani
University of Agadez, Niger

Reviewer 2: Sanni Babio
University of Parakou, Benin

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: SANI Abdoulwahid	
University/Country: University of Agadez Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/11/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/11/2023
Manuscript Title: CARACTERISATION GEOCHIMIQUE DES DEBLAIS DU SUBSTRATUM DE LA BAIE DU BANCO, ABIDJAN, BASSE COTE D'IVOIRE.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1103/23	
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.	3

<i>Yes</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Oui mais il y'a des coquilles à corriger</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Oui, il y'a des erreurs, du mal dit et des choses qu'il faut clarifier</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>Non il va falloir re-structurer la section méthodologie</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Il y'a des erreurs qu'il faut corriger et en plus certains ne sont pas commentés</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>La conclusion est très brève.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>oui</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il faut reprendre la section matériel et methods, en plus pour la section résultats il y'a des corrections importantes il faut apporter. Vous ne pouvez pas parachuter des tableaux ou figures sans commentaires.

Certains de vos résultats ne sont pas bien discutés.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je recommande l'acceptation de l'article après les corrections demander. Veuillez vérifier mes commentaires dans le texte.

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: BABIO Sanni	
University/Country: University of Parakou/BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/11/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/11/2023
Manuscript Title: CARACTERISATION GEOCHIMIQUE DES DEBLAIS DU SUBSTRATUM DE LA BAIE DU BANCO, ABIDJAN, BASSE COTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1103/23	
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.	5

The title is clear, short and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
No comment	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are few errors in the document that need to be corrected	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comment	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comment	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comment	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comment	

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):

Le document est très bon dans l'ensemble. Cependant, il doit être paginé et les fautes de formes corrigées pour améliorer sa qualité scientifique

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: