

Paper: "Impact des matériaux de protection des puits traditionnels à usage domestique sur la qualité de l'eau : cas de la commune de Yopougon, Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)"

Submitted: 05 March 2024 Accepted: 02 May 2024 Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Gnagne Agness Essoh Jean Eudes Yves

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p129

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yapo Habib KPIDI

NANGUI ABROGOUA University, ABIDJAN (Côte d'Ivoire)

Reviewer 2: Hicham ES-SOUFI Ibn Tofail University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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:		
KPIDI Yapo Habib		
University/Country: NANGUI ABROGOUA U	niversity, ABIDJAN (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/04/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: XXX	
Manuscript Title: Influence des matériaux de protection des puits traditionnels à usage domestique sur la qualité de l'eau : cas de la commune de Yopougon (Côte d'Ivoire)		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0331/24		
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.

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

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
Yes, but a title reformulation would give: "Impact des matériaux de traditionnels sur la qualité de l'eau: cas de la commune de Yopous d'Ivoire)"	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
In present abstract, objects, methods and results are mentioned w	ith light reformulation
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
A very small number of grammatical and orthographic errors of noted.	no consequence were
4. The study methods are explained clearly	4
(Please insert your comments)	
Yes, study methods clearly explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
Yes, the results are clear, do not contain errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
Yes, good!!	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
(Please insert your comments	
References standardization scoring will be required.	

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):

The authors should take into account the minimal observations made when publishing their article. These in no way detract from the study substance.

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: Hicham Es-soufi	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail University, Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/04/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/04/2024
Manuscript Title: Influence des matériaux de protection des puits traditionnels à usage domestique sur la qualité de l'eau : cas de la commune de Yopougon (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0331/24	
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 i	n 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.	4
The title conveys the content of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
I recommend that the authors correct a few French grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The study methods need some improvements.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
The discussion of results is not explained in a scientific manner.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The conclusions must contain the important results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Must reviewing the style of writing the references.	

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):

Your work presents a very important subject, especially since the whole world suffers from the lack of water. However, I recommend that you revise your work carefully.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 21/04/2024 Date Review Report Submitted: 26/04/2024

Manuscript Title: Influence des matériaux de protection des puits traditionnels à usage domestique sur la qualité de l'eau : cas de la commune de Yopougon (Côte d'Ivoire)

ESJ Manuscript Number:

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:

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.

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title was well formulated and highlighted the relevance of the subje	ct.
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The writing methodology was very good, and the different stages in the mentioned.	writing process were
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There aren't many grammatical errors, just as there aren't many spellin it's very appreciable.	g mistakes. All in all,
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Very good	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Exceptional	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Very good	•
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Add authors to increase the reference	

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): That the suggestions and recommendations that have been evaluated are included.