



**Paper: “Dynamique saisonnière du dioxyde d'azote (NO<sub>2</sub>) et du monoxyde de carbone (CO) dans le district d'Abidjan : analyse à l'aide de la télédétection et du WebSIG”**

**Submitted: 30 December 2025**

**Accepted: 12 March 2026**

**Published: 31 March 2026**

Corresponding Author: Djaha Levix Nadir Koffi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n9p171

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gbadamassi Fousséni  
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Osseni Abdel Aziz  
Université Nationale d'Agriculture, Bénin

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: Dr GBADAMASSI Fousséni	
University/Country: Université de Parakou/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/01/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/01/2026
Manuscript Title: Dynamique saisonnière du dioxyde d'azote (NO <sub>2</sub> ) et du monoxyde de carbone (CO) dans le district d'Abidjan : analyse par télédétection et WebSIG	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---32.01.2026---complete paper---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: no	
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.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>Le titre est clair et précis.</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b> <i>Le résumé comporte les différentes parties d'un résumé.</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>Les accords grammaticaux sont acceptables.</i>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <i>Les méthodes utilisées sont plus ou moins acceptable. Sauf qu'il y a quelques insuffisances soulignées dans les commentaires dont il faut tenir compte.</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Les résultats sont bien présentés.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La conclusion est acceptable.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les références sont bien présentées.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Prendre en compte les observations pour parfaire la qualité scientifique de l'article.**

**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: OSSENI Abdel Aziz	
University/Country: Université Nationale d'Agriculture, Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/02/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/02/2026
Manuscript Title: Dynamique saisonnière du dioxyde d'azote (NO <sub>2</sub> ) et du monoxyde de carbone (CO) dans le district d'Abidjan : analyse par télédétection et WebSIG	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0132/26	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>un complement a ete fait au titre</i>	4
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b> <i>La partie méthode doit etre un peu plus détaillée</i>	4
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments) ras</i>	4
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <i>La partie méthodologie aussi doit etre un peu plus détaillée</i>	3
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	3

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Compléter les références dans les différentes parties du document</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):** Il est nécessaire de retravailler le manuscrit pour lui donner un caractère scientifique. Les différentes parties doivent être renforcées et les choix doivent être justifiés. La partie WebGIS ne présente pas une base scientifique et peut être enlevée du manuscrit. La discussion peut être mieux développée.