

Paper: “Identifying areas of high gold potential using geochemical prospecting methods: the Tenado area in the Boromo Birimian belt, west-central Burkina Faso, West Africa”

Submitted: 22 October 2023

Accepted: 30 January 2024

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Pascal Ouiya

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n2p191

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Suphi Ural
Cukurova University, Turkey

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Suphi URAL	
University/Country: Cukurova University / TÜRKİYE	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 Jan 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 Jan 2024
Manuscript Title: Identifying areas of high gold potential using geochemical prospecting methods: the Tenado area in the Boromo Birimian belt, west-central Burkina Faso, West Africa.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1112/23	
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

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I believe that the title of the manuscript is clear and appropriate to its content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract of the manuscript clearly presents objects and results. On the other hand it should also explain the methods applied.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
This article contains significant grammatical and spelling errors.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are grammatical mistakes in the text. For example, why have authors used incomplete sentences several times? • Line 124: “A” should be explained. • Some references are not written according to the format. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The study methods are explained adequately.	
Line 93: The meaning of “BUMIGEB” should be explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results are containing some errors.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the title of Table-1 is "<i>Anomaly zone 1 and 2 stream sediment data table</i>", only samples from Zone 1 are included in the table in question. • The units of the analysis results in Table 1 and Table 3 should be given (% , ppm, ppb, etc.). • Line 144: “<i>A strong correlation is observed between Ni-Cr, Cu-Co-Zn, while gold (Au) shows weaker or stronger links between Co, Cu and Zn.</i>” The sentence should be expressed more clearly. • Figure 5 (A): Reference should be added. • Many studies cited in the article are not included in the reference list. • 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The results are accurate and supported by context.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

References are comprehensive and relevant. However, many studies cited in the article should be included in the reference list.

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):

I believe that the manuscript will make a significant contribution to the "search for orogenic gold deposits" studies. I think both field geologists and academics will benefit from the results of this research.

The minor revisions are needful. If some grammatical and spelling errors in the manuscript are corrected, it will be of better quality.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editor;

I investigated the manuscript entitled "*Identifying areas of high gold potential using geochemical prospecting methods: the Tenado area in the Boromo Birimian belt, west-central Burkina Faso, West Africa.*" with submission ID: 1112/23 and the comments are presented in the following to assist dear editor on submission reviewing process.

The authors have mentioned more clearly what results this study is presenting. I believe that the manuscript will make a significant contribution to the "*search for orogenic gold deposits*" studies. I think both field geologists and academics will benefit from the results of this research. The minor revisions are needful. If some grammatical and spelling errors in the manuscript are corrected, it will be of better quality.