



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Caractérisation physico-chimique de eaux de puits et forages destinées à la consommation humaine dans la commune Makiso à Kisangani (RDC) durant la saison pluvieuse”

Submitted: 23 April 2026

Accepted: 02 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Moussa Issoufou Djibo

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n18p130

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hassan Lemacha
Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Larbi Barhazi
Ecole supérieur architecture de Casablanca, Honoris United Universities

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation Physico-Chimique de eaux de Puits et Forages destinée à la consommation Humaine dans la Ville de Kisangani (RDC) : Cas de Commune Makiso	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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:	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	3
<i>The title accurately reflects the subject of the study and clearly indicates the focus of the research.</i>	

2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract is generally well-structured, but it could be improved by providing more detail on the methods used for the analysis.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are a few minor errors, but they do not hinder the overall understanding of the text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The methods are clearly described, making it possible to replicate the study if necessary.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are presented clearly, but some additional clarification on how to interpret the data would be helpful, particularly regarding the impact on human health and the explanation for the source of pollution and nitrogen-based contamination in boreholes and wells. You should also support your explanations with more recent references: DOI: 10.34874/PRSM.rejsd-vol1iss5.8313 DOI: 10.1016/j.eneco.2023.12.002</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are well supported by the results obtained, and they underscore the importance of the study.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references cited are relevant and cover the necessary aspects to support the article. I also recommend adding a few references in the discussion section to strengthen your findings.</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):

- I recommend revising the abstract to include more details about the analytical methods.
- I also suggest reviewing it for grammatical and spelling errors.
- It is essential to conduct a more in-depth analysis of the results presented, particularly by providing more detailed explanations of the variations observed in the physicochemical

parameters. For example, the acidic pH values measured in well water should be accompanied by a discussion of the environmental and anthropogenic factors that could influence them, such as agricultural practices and urbanization.

- The discussion should include a more systematic comparison with other similar studies conducted in comparable contexts. This would help place the results in a broader context and strengthen the validity of the conclusions. References to previous studies on water quality in similar regions would be particularly useful.
- The authors should discuss the implications of the findings for public health and the environment. For example, high levels of nitrites and iron in certain wells could have serious health consequences for consumers. A discussion of the need to monitor these water sources and implement corrective measures would be appropriate.
- A section on the study's limitations would be helpful. The authors should acknowledge any potential shortcomings in the methodology—such as the limited sample size or the data collection period—and explain how these might affect the results. This would enhance the study's transparency and credibility.
- The discussion section should be written in a clearer and more coherent manner. More concise sentences and a logical structure will help guide the reader through the arguments presented. A clearer articulation of the main ideas will make it easier to understand the issues raised by the results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article addresses an important and relevant topic, but it needs to be revised to improve the clarity and accuracy of the information presented.