



Paper: “The Seasonal Assessment of Heavy Metals Pollution in the Waters of the Mediterranean and Atlantic Seas of Morocco”

Submitted: 02 April 2025

Accepted: 05 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Karim S.

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p47

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Madan Maharjan

University of North Carolina at Pembroke, USA

Reviewer 2: Maria Trapali

Department of Biomedical Medicine, University of West Attica, Greece

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: MARIA TRAPALI	
University/Country: UNIWA/GREECE	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/8/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: The seasonal assessment of heavy metals pollution in the waters of the Mediterranean and Atlantic seas of Morocco	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The introduction contains several phrases and paragraphs that appear to be either directly copied or only slightly paraphrased from scientific publications and manuals (e.g., UNEP, WHO, EPA, peer-reviewed articles). The pollutant lists, the descriptions of heavy metal properties, and the standardized statements about health impacts are conventional and appear verbatim in many sources. Turnitin is likely to flag these with a high similarity score.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The text contains multiple sections that appear to be directly copied from scientific papers, particularly in the introduction and methodology.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
In a few places, there is repetition of information (e.g., the description of the same potential pollution sources appears twice in different sections). This can be removed or consolidated. Comparisons with other regions should preferably be placed in a separate subsection so as not to interrupt the flow of the analysis.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>115 matches found with Turnitin's database</i> Show <i>86 Not Cited or Quoted 21%</i> <i>29 Missing Quotations 6%</i> The text contains multiple sections that appear to be directly copied from scientific papers, particularly in the introduction and methodology. <i>Make all the references with the same style e.g. APA style.</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):

1. What does ML in the tables mean?
2. Change mg/l in mg/L
3. In several places, the use of commas and periods is inconsistent, e.g., *0,014* (comma) and *0.014* (period). A single system should be chosen (either the European format with a comma or the English/US format with a period) and applied consistently throughout the document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Madan Maharjan	
University/Country: USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/19/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/26/2025
Manuscript Title: The seasonal assessment of heavy metals pollution in the waters of the Mediterranean and Atlantic seas of Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.---44.04.2025	
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. Yes, it is.	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. Result: insufficient quantitative detail	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. A lot of grammatical errors and formatting issues including figure numberings, references, text etc.	1
4. The study methods are explained clearly. Yes, it is acceptable, but it is missing key information regarding precise locations of samples and number of samples collected for the study.	3

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
It would be much clearer to have separate data/result only and interpretation of the results in a discussion section.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>It is fine but must strengthen the section with quantitative comparisons to standards and have specific recommendations for future works.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>It needs cleaning duplicates and standardizes citation style.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please see detailed comments embedded in the manuscript document and a separate document with general comments.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: