

Paper: **“Réhabilitation et Valorisation d’Anciens Sites Miniers en Champ de Tomate”**

Submitted: 23 August 2024

Accepted: 23 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Camara Rachel Honorine

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p335

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: A. Séraphin Zanklan
Université Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Lonceny Traore
University Gamal Abdel Nasser of Conakry Republic of Guinea

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. But, it too long and might be therefore shortened and then reformulated.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. But, revise the abstract. Avoid giving into references. Avoid also abbreviations inside. Try to shorten it according to ESJ-guidelines. Revise the full English version of it.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are many grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article. Please, check and correct them.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods need to be improved for a reader better understanding of the object.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper has to be revised for a better understanding.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

There are no section named Conclusions in the present report. Nevertheless, discussions shall be better outspread, and conclusions might be clearer presented for good repeatability and further researches on those areas of research. After the conclusions, authors should give clearly insights into future studies in that area and allied ones.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are not enough comprehensive and appropriate. They need revisions to be tighter to ESJ-requirements.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The work is original. However, it need many revisions to improve the form of the report. Grammar and language skills are to be revised. The author(s) should revise also the editing style of the whole report, so that it can refer to the requirements of ESJ. More explanations are needed with relevance to the effects of mines on the quality and security offered by plants after rehabilitation of ancient mining sites like that study presented by the author(s) of the current report. Conclusions may on go in such direction.

Also, there are the lacks of information upon the funding source of the research, the acknowledgements, and the declaration on conflict of competing and interest.

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: Lonceny TRAORE	
University/Country: University Gamal Abdel Nasser of Conakry Republic of Guinea	
Date Manuscript Received: 2024/11/01	Date Review Report Submitted: 2024/11/09
Manuscript Title: « REHABILITATION ET VALORISATION D'ANCIENS SITES MINIERS EN CHAMP DE TOMATE : CAS DE L'ANCIENNE CARRIERE DE HAMDALLAYE DANS LA COMMUNE RURALE DE SANGAREDI, PREFECTURE DE BOKÉ, REPUBLIQUE DE DE GUINÉE »	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.09.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: I have no objection	
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:	

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>(The wording is perfectly in line with the methodological approach)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Since it is ultimately about tomato production, the author must mention the performance 13.09T/ha in place of satisfactory results)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(A few two or three very insignificant errors)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(The methodological approach is well explained in three steps:- site development ; - Evaluation of site performance ; - agricultural production)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Results are presented clearly and according to the experimental approach)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(The conclusion is supported by recommendations)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(References are appropriate)</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):

- **Mention the meaning of abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Write the formulas for the parameters determined in Materials and Methods**
- **In the tables presented put the legend at the bottom**
- **The title of the conclusion must be visible**
- **Reread to correct the two or three errors encountered**