

Paper: “Evidence of komatiitic basalt enclaves in the Téra-Ayorou pluton (Liptako, West Niger) (West African Craton)”

Submitted: 25 April 2024

Accepted: 28 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Abdourahamane Attourabi Sofiyane

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n14p74](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n14p74)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amina Wafik
Université Cadi Ayyad, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Pyabalo Eugène Katansao
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Reviewer 3: Sarakawa Abalo Malibida Kpanzou
University of Lomé, Togo

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: KPANZOU Sarakawa Abalo Malibida	
University/Country: University of Lomé	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/05/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/05/2024
Manuscript Title: Evidence of komatiitic basalt enclaves in the Téra-Ayorou pluton (Liptako, West Niger) (West African Craton)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---36---21.05.2024---	
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.	4
<i>The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract lacks an aim and a methodology, which need to be briefly explained.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study METHODS are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Only the petrographic results are presented. The geochemical results are buried in the discussion. It would be desirable to present the petrographic results and the geochemical results before discussing them.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The list of references is comprehensive. They are used in text in an accurate way but doi are not specified.</i>	

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):

None

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: WAFIK Amina	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 30.04.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.05.2024
Manuscript Title: Evidence of komatiitic basalt enclaves in the Téra-Ayorou pluton (Liptako, West Niger) (West African Craton)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 36_21.05.2024	
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:	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Identification of Komatiitic Basalt Enclaves in the Téra-Ayorou Pluton, Liptako, West Niger (West African Craton)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The abstract contains a detailed description of geological findings and interpretations, but does not explicitly present the methods used for obtaining or analyzing these results. It needs to be completed.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Thoroughly review the manuscript for grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors. Ensure that sentences are well-constructed and easy to understand.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
It lacks specific details about the methodologies (e.g., analytical techniques, data collection, experimental setup), that were employed to determine the geochemical characteristics and the relationships described. It lacks a sampling map.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The discussion is too short (e.g., comparison with other enclaves from West African Craton). The discussion is very “local”, and could be extended to other enclaves from West African Craton (composition, age, source etc...).	
The results are clear however the discussion is poor and has to be improved, by discussing the geochemical results (major, trace, and REE). The trends in the bivariate and the ternary diagrams. The authors should give the genetic model based on the findings. It lacks the analytic table.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusion has to be improved, based on key findings after improving the discussion.	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Yes but the authors have to ensure that that all the references cited in the text are present in the bibliographic list and the respect the . Please check this.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The discussion is too short (e.g., comparison with other enclaves from West African Craton).
The discussion is very “local”, and could be extended to other enclaves from West African Craton (composition, age, source etc...).

The discussion section should provide interpretations, comparisons with previous work, and the implications of the findings.

The authors have to provide a thoroughly revised manuscript along with a point by-point response delineating how you addressed the comments.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

University/Country: Belgrade / Serbia	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.05.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.05.2024
Manuscript Title: Evidence of komatiitic basalt enclaves in the Téra-Ayorou pluton (Liptako, West Niger) (West African Craton)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0000-0002-8293-4944	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes, no problem	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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): the wording is adapted to the geological realities of the area.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments): It presents almost all the results.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments): Some of the sentences need to be reworded and other punctuation needs to be revised.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments): The various analyses were presented, but no details were given of how the analysis data was processed to obtain the results shown.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments): the results are not too distinguishable from the discussions.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments): it sums up the content of the text.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments): A few punctuation and layout errors.</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): I suggest that the author add the method of processing the analysis data to the methodology and review the position of certain punctuation marks. suggests him to put the text in word format in time new roman with a font size of 12.