



Paper: “Evaluation de la pollution en éléments traces métalliques du sol sur Moringa (Moringa oleifera L.) et Basilic (Ocimum basilicum L.) au Centre de Recherches Géologique et Minière de Niamey au Niger, en Afrique de l’Ouest”

Submitted: 10 January 2025

Accepted: 18 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Mahamane Moustapha Souley Barhadje

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n9p111

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gala Bi Trazié Jérémie
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Cocody (Abidjan), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Adama Ilboudo
Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

This one would be better "Evaluation de la pollution en éléments traces métalliques: cas des végétaux Moringa (*Moringa oleifera* L), Basilic (*Ocimum basilicum* L.) et des sols du Centre de Recherches Géologique et Minière de Niamey au Niger, en Afrique de l'Ouest."

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes! but the proposed amendments must be taken into account

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

Yes! Notified in the revised file

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Yes! there are a few errors notified in the revised file.

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes! But one or two have not been listed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

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]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

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):

The manuscript provides good information. However, some observations have been made for an improvement of the document. Furthermore, the discussion should be strictly linked to the data presented in the results, because it sometimes evokes notions such as "Zone 4", "Zone 5" which are not found in the methodology or in the results.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: ILBOUDO Adama	
University/Country: Université Joseph KI-ZERBO /Burkina Faso	

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la pollution en éléments traces métalliques du sol sur Moringa (<i>Moringa oleifera</i> L) et Basilic (<i>Ocimum basilicum</i> L.) au Centre de Recherches Géologique et Minière de Niamey au Niger, en Afrique de l'Ouest	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 56.01.2025	
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.	5
The title is clear and the developed content corresponds	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents the objects, methods and results.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Explanations on the methods are clearly provided	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are well presented and clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The summary and conclusion are well supported by the content	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references are comprehensive but not very appropriate.	

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):

- Le résumé doit commencer par la justification du contexte de l'étude avant l'objectif
- Ordonner selon les dates, des plus anciennes aux plus récentes
- Eviter de citer des auteurs datant de plus de 10ans sauf dans la méthodologie
- Il faut vous conformer aux critères de la revue (guide de l'auteur du journal) en matière de citation
- Faites figurer tous les auteurs dans la bibliographie