

Paper: “Evaluation de la qualité physico-chimique des eaux de surface et des eaux des nappes au niveau de deux zones humides continentales en Mauritanie : Mahmouda et Tamourt Naaj”

Submitted: 30 July 2024

Accepted: 15 April 2025

Published: 30 April 2025

Corresponding Author: Ahmed Aliyenne

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n12p121

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: L. Aicha Lrhorfi
Université Ibn Tofail, Kénitra. Maroc

Reviewer 2: Kouame Paze
Université Félix Houphouet Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Dr KOUAME Pazé	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 08 Octobre 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/08/2024
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la qualité physico- chimique des eaux de surface et des eaux des nappes au niveau de deux zones humides continentales en Mauritanie : Mahmouda et Tamourt En aj	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0738/24	
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:	

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.	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Il aurait été intéressant que vous nous citez succinctement les logiciels utilisés pour le traitement des données.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Cet article comporte des erreurs en particulier dans l'utilisation du point et des majuscules.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>Des informations absentes dans la méthodologie et qui apparaissent dans les résultats ne permettent pas de comprendre les résultats présentés en lien avec les sites sélectionnés pour l'étude. Les informations liées à la méthodologie doivent être plus explicites.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats ne sont pas tous discutés.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références ne tiennent pas compte du modèle de référence APA recommandé par la revue.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: LRHORFI Lalla Aicha	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/10/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/10/2024
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la qualité physico- chimique des eaux de surface et des eaux des nappes au niveau de deux zones humides continentales en Mauritanie : Mahmouda et Tamourt En aj	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: oui	

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>Le titre est clair, À vérifier juste le nom de la région Tamourt (En aj ou Naaaj) Dans le titre s'écrit (En aj) et dans quelques figures (Naaaj)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>À comparer le résumé avec ce qu'est présenté dans la partie résultats</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2

<i>Il ya des fautes d'orthographe, des mots et des phrases mal exprimés surtout au niveau de l'introduction (à revoir totalement)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Dans la partie méthode, l'auteur n'a pas mentionné la nature de l'échantillon (eaux de surfaces et eaux des nappes) et le nombre des échantillons</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Pour le paramètre T°, l'auteur présente les résultats des eaux des nappes juste pour 3 échantillons (figure 4), mais dans le texte il parle des eaux de surfaces, également la valeur max sur le graphe est plus 33°C et dans le texte s'est affiché 32°C. Pour la conductivité, il a mentionné dans le résumé qu'elle est entre $10\ \mu\text{S/cm}$ et $237\ \mu\text{S/cm}$ et ce n'est pas le cas dans les résultats. D'une façon Générale les résultats ne sont pas bien exploités (À voir les autres paramètres)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>À revoir et conclure sur la totalité de travail (2 régions d'étude, 2 eaux "surfaces et nappes" et plusieurs paramètres..)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Quelques rectifications</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):

Dans le résumé présentez les résultats de chaque région et préférez d'utiliser des méthodes statistiques (pour avoir une corrélation entre les 2 régions, les nappes et les eaux de surfaces et les différents paramètres) et pour faciliter également la comparaison entre vos résultats et celles des références et avoir plus de fiabilité

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title accurately reflects the content of the paper. It is descriptive enough to indicate the study's focus on the physicochemical quality of surface and groundwater in two wetlands in Mauritania. Evidence of this can be seen in the sections that describe water quality assessment through various physicochemical parameters, which align with the title's scope.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract effectively presents the study's objectives, methodology, and results, though it could be more concise. It provides an overview of the importance of wetlands and the specific goals of assessing water quality. It also mentions the use of analytical tools like Piper and Schoeller diagrams. However, including specific quantitative results might be more informative and provide a more transparent snapshot of the study's findings.

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

The paper contains several minor grammatical and spelling errors, likely due to translation or non-native language issues. Examples include phrases like:

- "Constitute the most productive ecosystems," which could better read, "are among the most productive ecosystems."
- "Result of the measurement campaign would" could be rephrased for clarity to "the measurement campaign results would."

These minor corrections could improve readability significantly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are described thoroughly, and the explanation is straightforward. The authors outline the sample collection process, water quality test types, and equipment. However, more detail on why specific tests were chosen and their relevance to the study would enhance this section. A brief mention of the analysis software (e.g., Excel for diagram translation) is included but could be expanded upon for clarity.

The article is generally well-organized, following a logical structure with sections like Introduction, Methodology, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. Each section flows into the next, making it easy to follow the research process and findings. However, the paper is lengthy in some sections, particularly in the Results and Discussion, where excessive detail can sometimes obscure the main findings.

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

The body is comprehensive but could benefit from conciseness in the results section, where extensive numeric data are presented. Organizing this data into tables rather than lengthy narrative descriptions might enhance readability. The content is generally clear and coherent, with logical arguments supported by data. Some phrases are repetitive, which affects the paper's flow.

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

The conclusion summarizes the study well, indicating that the water quality is suitable for specific uses and highlights the ecological importance of the wetlands. However,

it could be improved by directly connecting to particular results presented in the paper. For instance, referring to critical quantitative results on pH, TDS, and conductivity would strengthen the conclusion's linkage to the study's findings.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is comprehensive and appears to cover relevant literature. The format is mostly consistent; however, minor inconsistencies in formatting need attention. For example:

- Ensure that all journal names are formatted in the same way.
- Some entries have inconsistent spacing and capitalization.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

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]

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 paper demonstrates scientific competitiveness in its detailed approach to water quality assessment in under-researched areas like Mauritania. The data could be valuable for future comparative studies or local conservation efforts. However, its readability and presentation could be refined to ensure broader accessibility and impact.

This paper is scientifically valuable and worthy of publication. However, before publication, minor grammatical corrections, clarity improvements in the abstract and conclusion, and a restructuring of the results for readability would enhance the

manuscript's quality. These revisions would make the study more accessible to readers, including those outside the immediate field of environmental science.
