

Paper: “Changement climatique : recherche des signaux au Tchad à travers l'étude des villes de Bol, Fianga, Moundou et N'Djamena”

Submitted: 24 April 2024

Accepted: 12 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Semingar Ngaryamngaye

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p82](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p82)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kolotioloma Alama Coulibaly
Université Félix Houphouet, Ivory Coast

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: 07MAY 2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Changement climatique : recherche de signaux au Tchad à travers l'étude des villes de Bol, Fianga, Moundou et N'Djamena	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
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.	2
This title doesn't really fit with the content of the article. We need to review the wording of the title based on the evolution of climate variation	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
The diagnosis of the theme has not been well defined and the problem is not well formulated except that it is almost non-existent. The 4 specific indicators listed in the introduction have not been defined in the article.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
These errors are small.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
no the methods are explained but not all. Also the author did not highlight the added value of this article. The figures are not very well processed.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
the results are not well analyzed and the figures are not well processed	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The discussion is well addressed except that there are personalized sentences in the text. Also, it is necessary to update the authors cited in the discussion. The conclusion seems clear to me.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>No comment</i>	

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	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author must review the wording of his article while clearly explaining the methodology addressed, the restructuring of the study area and properly handling the tables and figures.

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: COULIBALY Kolotioloma Alama	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny Abidjan	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Changement climatique : recherche de signaux au Tchad à travers l'étude des villes de Bol, Fianga, Moundou et N'Djamena	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>J'ai fait une proposition de reformulation du titre dans l'article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Revoir l'objectif de l'article. Les résultats ne sont pas quantitatives pour une telle étude statistique. Les applications de l'étude sur la santé par exemple ne sont pas abordées ni dans la méthodologie ni dans les résultats.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Les phrases sont trop longues, donc difficiles à comprendre.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Revoir la structuration des méthodes. Elles doivent suivre un ordre logique de votre travail (faire au besoins des sous-titres selon les points abordés)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Revoir l'articulation des résultats selon la logique de la méthodologie</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Reprendre la conclusion en la dissociant de la discussion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Il faut harmoniser l'écriture des références bibliographiques</i>	

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	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Reformater l'article selon les normes de la revue et le soumettre à nouveau;
- utiliser la forme affirmative dans vos phrases;
- le lien d'impact sur la santé n'est pas abordé dans l'article. Donc, il faut se limiter aux aspects climatiques;
- Relire le document pour corriger les fautes d'orthographe et de grammaire.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: