

Paper: “Activités anthropiques, sources de pollutions chimiques des rivières Sô et Djonou tributaires du lac Nokoué”

Submitted: 15 March 2024

Accepted: 28 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Wilfrid Noudéhouéno Atchichoe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p274

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gnagne Agness Esoh Jean Eudes Yves
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Yarou Halissou
Univerty of Abomey-Calavi, Benin

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: GNAGNE Agness Essoh Jean Eudes Yves	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received: 14-05-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 21-05-2024
Manuscript Title: Les activités anthropiques, sources de pollutions chimiques des rivières Sô et Djonou tributaires du lac Nokoué	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0354/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/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/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.

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

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Bien	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<p>2-1 Etat des lieux de la pollution du lac Nokoué et ses affluents</p> <p>Bien que cette partie soit le fruit de la bibliographie, elle se présente comme une discussion. Il faut plutôt présenter les résultats dans des tableaux et transférer cette partie dans la discussion ;</p> <p>Le sexe des populations a-t-il un impact sur le lac en terme de pollution, peut être leur niveau d'instruction. Aussi, en lieu et place des groupes sociaux professionnels, faut-il interroger les activités agricoles menée sur les rives des lagunes et susceptibles de les polluer</p> <p>2-2.4 Maladies et concept de pollution selon les ménages</p> <p>C'est une conséquence de la pollution des lagunes et non une activité polluante des lagunes. Il faut donc revoir ce point. C'est plutôt 2.3</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Bien	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Il faut revoir et corriger les dates de certaines références	

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):

Il faut créer un chapeau pour une partie de l'introduction; Ex. Présentation de la commune So Ava

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: YAROU Halissou	
University/Country: Univerty of Abomey-Calavi/Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/05/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/05/2024
Manuscript Title: Activités anthropiques, sources de pollutions chimiques des rivières Sô et Djonou tributaires du lac Nokoué	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0354/24	
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 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>Remove the "les" which starting the title</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract is too long, please reduce this.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Reread the document for minor grammatical correction.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Very clear</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are very clear but not place at the good position. The figures must be following the text which explain them. The section intitle "2-1 Etat des lieux de la pollution du lac Nokoué et ses affluents" can be removed.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>No comment</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>No comment</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): All the information is on the document, it's just a question of organizing it properly to produce a good scientific

document. Each figure must follow the text that explains it. Remember also to check the length of the summary and introduction.