

Paper: "Deferrisation Physocochimique des eaux Souterraines: Revue"

Submitted: 05 November 2023 Accepted: 28 February 2024 Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Benjamain Tiadjoue

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hassan Lemacha

Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Naïma El Assaoui Mohammed V University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: 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: Pr. Hassan LEMACHA			
University/Country: Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc			
Date Manuscript Received: 08-01-2024 Date Review Report Submitted: 19-01-2024			
Manuscript Title: DEFERRISATION PHYSICOCHIMIQUE DES EAUX SOUTERRAINES : REVUE			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1142/23			
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Revoire les mots clés (la correction sur le document attaché)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Ajouter vos propres résultats et faire une étude comparative avec l' regroupés dans le travail.	les résultats
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Utilizer des references bibliographiques récentes (2021-2024) pou valeur à votre travail	ır donner une

## **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):**

- 1. Ajouter une adresse mail;
- 2. Des mots clés ne figurant pas dans le résumé;
- 3. Utiliser les mêmes mots clés pour le résumé en fraçais et en anglais ;
- 4. Revoire la figure 2;
- 5. Des corrections sont marquees en rouge et bleu;
- 6. Numéroter les equations sur les pages 13 et 15 ;
- 7. Ajoutez des références récentes pour améliorer la qualité du travail (2020, 2021, 2024);
- 8. Revoire la structure du premier paragraphe de la page 18.

Bonne chance

# 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: EL ASSAOUI NAIMA				
University/Country: Mohammed V University/ Morocco				
Date Manuscript Received: 19/01/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/01/2024			
Manuscript Title: Deferrisation physicochimique des eaux souterraines : Revue				
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1142/23				
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.

Ouestions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

The title is clear but not adequate to the content of the article. This study is about a synthesis of work on groundwater deferrization

The title is clear, but not adequate to the content of the article. The manuscript intends to present a bibliographical study in the field of physicochemical deferrization of groundwater. However, all the bibliographical references presented in the manuscript are very old, most of them being between 40 and 60 years old or more. It would seem that the development of this science stopped a century ago. In addition, the study area was not specified: in one case, it was countries south of the Sahara; in another, countries in Africa, the Middle East and tropical Africa. The problematic in these areas has been proposed and some results presented without giving corresponding references to the source of the information or the authors who contributed to the study.

# 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

3

The summary presents the objective of the work and clearly explains that it is a bibliographical synthesis and talks about the results of physicochemical deferrization technologies. However, the study area is not specified. In the abstract, the authors refer to countries south of the Sahara, in the introduction to Africa and the Middle East, and to tropical Africa.

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

3

Some words and phrases are bolded or enlarged, such as:

« Karstique » page 4 ; la phrase » peut être éliminé par une complexation.....aux complexe - puis un signe Bizart avant ALOFe+ » page 18 :

Le paragraphe « suivi de l'hydroxyde de fer......(Sharma (2021). » le texte en entier est présenté avec une écriture bizarre. Page 17. Ce même paragraphe représente le travail de Sharma (2001). Le nom de l'auteur ne doit pas répété à la fin de la citation.

La phrase « Cette étude qui ...........dans le domaine. » doit être reformulée et doit être terminée par un point.

La figure 2 est à compléter ou à refaire les contenus dans les carreaux sont soit absents ou non lisibles.

Most of the quotations do not correspond to the ESJ model standard and the same quotation is presented differently each time in the manuscript, for example :

(Weener Stum et G. Fred Lee 19961 (12), Stumm et Lee 1961 page 10, (Stumm et Lee, 1961) page 10, Stumm et lee (1961), Stum et Lee, 1961)

*See section 7 for bibliographical references.* 

The entire last paragraph of the conclusion should be reworded.

### 4. The study methods are explained clearly.

2

The study methodology is not clearly defined. It's just a succession of paragraphs with no sequence, no explanation and no references.

#### 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.

2

Pleas Les résultats doivent être sous forme de citations des travaux de recherche réalisés dans le domaine, malheureusement ce manuscrit ne présente que les résultats des études très anciennes.

e insert your comments

# 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

2

We can't conclude without reviewing all the recent articles and various publications by researchers and organizations concerning standards and the physicochemical deferrization of groundwater worldwide.

Technologies have evolved considerably, and there are several hundred publications in this field.

Explain how this work could:

Continue to contribute to the development of water treatment technologies? And Fighting the problem of access to clean drinking water?

And why only in developing countries?

### 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

1

There are a total of 145 references, 100 of which are on the list of references relating to the manuscript and 45 cited in the manuscript but not listed with the references.

All the references are old and not appropriate to the content There are (6) references numbered as follows (4, 10, 18, 20, 30 and 73), among the 100 that exist in the list of references, are not cited in the manuscript.

A further 45 references (see list below) are cited in the manuscript but do not exist in the manuscript reference list

*List of citations not listed in the manuscript references:* 

CNRS -Nancy

Edwards G.A. et Amirtharajah, 1985

Mohtadi et Rao. 1973

CE. 1998

Memento Degremont, 2003

Amira Doggaz, 2021

UNESCO, 1978

Rhama Hamdouni, 2017

Rhama Hamdeni, 2018

Dégremont, 2003

Dégremont SUEZ

Awwarf, 1976

*Bays et al., 1970* 

Awwa, 1990

WHO, 2004

Heinke, 1989

François Marie Paul SAMBOU, 2001

Sarah Rio, 2016

Herceberg et Lafong, 1991

CREPA, 1996 (1)

*Michalaos et al, 1997 (1)* 

Heddam et al., 2002;

Heddam et Dechemi, 2008

Heddam et al. 2011a, 2011b, 2011c

Gosh and O'Connor, 1966 page 9

Chenk et Weber 1968 page11

Tamura et al (1976a) page 11

Valiron, 1989 page12

Amirtharajah et O'mélia, 1990 page 12

Dempsey et al., 1985 page 12

Edwards G.A. et Amirtharajah, 1985 page 12

Baxter et al., 1999 page 15,

Baxter et al., 2001b, 2002 page 16

Bernazeau et al. (1990) page 15

Critchley et al. 1990 page 15

Ellis et al. 1991 page 15

Girou et al., 1992 page 15

Van Leeuwen et al.; 1999a page 15

Gagnon et al., 1997 page 16

Maier et al, 2004 page 16

Chen et Hou, 2006 page 16

Elwakeel et al. (2009) page 17

Choo et al, 2005 pages 18 and 19

Volchek et al. (1993) pages 18 and 19

Kenari et al. (2016) page 18

The references in the manuscript do not correspond to the instructions in the ESJ model and the same quotation is written in several different forms and styles (slanted, bold, lowercase and uppercase), sometimes missing letters.

Example:

(Weener Stum et G. Fred Lee 19961 (12), Stumm et Lee 1961 page 10,

(Stumm et Lee, 1961) page 10, Stumm et lee (1961), Stum et Lee, 1961) Mcbainn et al., 1901, McBainn (1901)

El Azher, 2008, Azher et al, 2008

Michalakos et al., 1997, Michalaos et al, 1997 (1) page 8

Tamura et al 1976a, Tamura et Al 1976, Tamura et al (1976a),

Millero et al 1987, Millero et al (1989), Millero et Izaguirre (1989), Millero (1989)

## **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed

Accepted, minor revision needed

Return for major revision and resubmission

<b>—</b> ·	
Reject	
Reject	
_	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The article needs to be re-edited on the basis of the various comments and given a structure to the manuscript containing an introduction, methodology and results, ending with a conclusion. The objective must be precise and the editing must conform to the ESJ model instructions.

The addition of more and new bibliographical references is necessary.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**