

Paper: “Evaluation de la Qualité Physico-Chimique et Microbiologique des eaux de Puits Consommées dans le Quartier Kombé à Brazzaville”

Submitted: 06 September 2023

Accepted: 16 April 2024

Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Louzayadio Mvouezolo Raison Félicien

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p82

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kpan Oulai

Peleforo GON COULIBALY University of Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Akissi Nathalie Kouadio

Reviewer 4: 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 25/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/09/2023
Title: Evaluation De La Qualité Physico-Chimique et Microbiologique Des Eaux De Puits Consommées Dans Le Quartier Kombé À Brazzaville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29 ---37.09.2023	
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: No	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(No comment for this item)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>(Abstract clearly presents objectives, methods and results. English version should be rewrite and revise by native English speaker.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this manuscript. I recommend authors to revised this manuscript)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Authors should rewrite this section. As presented, it looks like as a report, but, not as a scientific research)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Results are consistent and clear. But, the number of well water used for this study is to little and not representative of the Kombé district). So, I have some doubts.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(No comment, see manuscript)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Authors must enhanced and add more and adapted references)</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):

Authors can find all my comments and suggestion in the manuscript

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: Dr KPAN Oulai Jean-Gautier	
University/Country: Peleforo GON COULIBALY University of Korhogo / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: Monday 09/25/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: Sunday 10/01/2023
Manuscript Title: Evaluation De La Qualité Physico-Chimique et Microbiologique Des Eaux De Puits Consommées Dans Le Quartier Kombé À Brazzaville or Evaluation of Physicochemical and Microbiological Quality of Well Waters Consumed in the Kombé District of Brazzaville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results reflect the title. However, the number of wells is insufficient	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The summary is well developed but the proposed treatment does not take into account certain parameters	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, the document is well written with fewer mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methodology must be expanded (see comments in the manuscript)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results should be reorganized by location. Some questions asked need to be answered.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is good but it must take into account the comments and suggestions made in the document	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It is recent and consistent with the theme addressed.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The proposed work is very interesting. However, the number of wells analyzed is insufficient. Some results are discussed without having been commented on.

You must take into account the comments and suggestions made in the document

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work presented deserves to be published in ESJ. However, it must be corrected according to the remarks and suggestions made in the document.

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: 25/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/10/2023
Manuscript Title: Evaluation De La Qualité Physico-Chimique et Microbiologique Des Eaux De Puits Consommées Dans Le Quartier Kombé À Brazzaville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29.---37.09.2023	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	4
<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 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):

Authors declare that they do not have any conflict of interest.

Each author must indicate his or her contribution in this manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: