



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Groundwater Potential Zone Mapping in the Department of Boundiali (Northern Côte d’Ivoire) Using the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) and GIS”

Submitted: 05 March 2026

Accepted: 06 October 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Corresponding Author: Serge Kouakou Deh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p272

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pyabalo Eugène Katansao
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Reviewer 2: Madan Maharjan
University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP), USA

Reviewer 3: Sirelda Bele
Albanian Geological Survey, Albania

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

yes the title is appropriate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

yes

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

more or less, but acceptable

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, but it could be improved by combining some of the comments and images on the same frame.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

good results with minor errors

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

Acceptable

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are some missing that he need to add

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 RESULTS 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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest you introduce the consistency ratio to ensure consistency in judgements and weightings.

If you have geophysical data, it would be best to use it for validation

In the methodology, you can link some of the images during the layout process.

Please note the missing references

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

include Remote sensing as well

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract is understandable, but it is not sufficiently clear or polished in its current form. I would recommend revision before publication.

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

more than a few

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

See attached document for further comments

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

See attached document for further comments

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

See attached document for further comments

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

See attached document for further comments

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See attached document for further comments

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear and generally reflects the scope and methodology of the study. However, I suggest a slight revision to improve its academic style and readability. In particular, “in the department of Boundiali” could be replaced with “in Boundiali Department,” and “Analytical Hierarchy Process” should preferably be written as “Analytic Hierarchy Process.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract is generally well written and provides a clear overview of the study objectives, data, methodology, and main findings. The quantitative results are also appropriately reported. However, I recommend improving the consistency of terminology throughout the abstract, particularly regarding the terms “groundwater availability,” “accessibility,” “exploitability,” and “groundwater potential.”⁸

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is appropriate and well aligned with the objectives of the study. The selected methods are relevant and correctly applied to the study area. The methodological approach is clearly presented and generally easy to follow. Overall, the methodology provides a sound basis for the analysis and results.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are clear and well presented. They are logically organized and easy to understand. The findings are relevant to the objectives of the study. Overall, the results are consistent with the methodology.

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

The conclusions are well supported by the content and results of the study. They are consistent with the findings and appropriately reflect the main outcomes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is relevant and generally appropriate for the topic. The references adequately support the content and findings of the study. The cited sources are clearly presented and properly integrated into the manuscript. Overall, the reference list is satisfactory.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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 RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is clear and well organized. The methodology, results, and conclusions are appropriate and consistent with the study objectives. I recommend only minor grammatical and editorial corrections before publication.
