

Paper: “Vermicomposting of Sludge from the Camp SIC Cité-Verte Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yaounde-Cameroon)”

Submitted: 13 December 2023

Accepted: 23 February 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Emilienne Laure Ngahane

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n6p200

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lamine Ousmane
Dan Dicko Dankoulodo University, Niger

Reviewer 2: Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldívar
Technical University of Manabi, Ecuador

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: LAMINOUS Ousmane	
University/Country: Dan Dicko Dankoulodo University	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/12/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/12/2023
Manuscript Title: Vermicomposting of sludge from the Camp SIC Cité-Verte wastewater treatment plant (Yaounde-Cameroon)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1252/23	
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.	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>No comment. Correct abstract</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few spelling mistake and grammatical errors. Correct language was used.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes, methods were clearly presented</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>No, the results presented are correct</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Conclusion can be ameliorated. Should not repeat the numeric results but the results interest.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>No comment, it is correct</i>	

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): Read above

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: None

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: 01/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/02/2024
Manuscript Title: Vermicomposting of sludge from the Camp SIC Cité-Verte wastewater treatment plant (Yaounde-Cameroon)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1252/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>The title is clear, synthesizes the results of the research and has less than 15 words.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The abstract presents abbreviations.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are units of measurement attached to the numerical values; no space between them. One-digit numbers are written with the number, not with letters. Units of measurement are written incorrectly, e.g. the unit of volume liters is written (l), when the correct unit is (L).</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	0
<i>Of the 23 bibliographic references, only four correspond to the last five years, which represents only 17.4%; therefore, it is quite outdated. In fact, most of the 19 outdated references are more than 10 years old. The bibliographic references should be updated to make the results more current and objective.</i>	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: