Paper: **"Qualité des données hydrométriques prédites par une approche machine learning dans l'évaluation de la resource en eau au nord de la Cote d'Ivoire"**

Corresponding Author: Satti Jean Robert Kamenan

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N'cho Aristide Attoh
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is indeed clear in relation to the content of the article
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract presented in this article does indeed include the building blocks of a well-structured abstract. We can therefore have a general idea of the article as soon as we read the abstract.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
I did not find a grammatical error leading to an error of interpretation, other readings and verifications will validate the absence of significant mistakes
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
I found the explanation of the methods simple and concise, a good asset for reproducibility for further studies
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
the body of the document is well structured and complies with writing rules
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The content largely supported the abstract of the article, we actually find what had previously been said in the abstract in the article
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
All references cited can be found in the content of the article as well as in the bibliographic reference
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):