



Paper: “**Modélisation de la Relation Pluie-Débit dans un Contexte de Gestion en Eau : Cas du Sous Bassin Versant du N’zi en Côte d’Ivoire**”

Corresponding Author: Marie Nguessan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p62

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rachid Ismaili. Ministère de la santé- Maroc

Reviewer 2: Paulin Ouoba, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: De Lasme Omer Z., Universitépeleforo Gon Coulibaly / Côte d’Ivoire

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: ISMAILI RACHID	
University/Country: Ministère de la santé- Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/05/2020
Manuscript Title: Modélisation de la Relation Pluie-Débit à Partir du Modèle GR dans un Contexte de Gestion en Eau : Cas du Sous Bassin Versant du N'zi (Centre-Est de la Côte D'ivoire en Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 5	
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.

<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.	3
Il faut éliminer la phrase suivante du titre: Centre-Est de la Côte D'ivoire en Afrique de l'Ouest	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Il faut développer davantage la conclusion et préciser les perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Il faut chercher des références plus récentes	

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):

Non

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Non

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Paulin Ouoba	Email:
University/Country: Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/5/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 8/6/2020
Manuscript Title: Modélisation de la Relation Pluie-Débit à Partir du Modèle GR dans un Contexte de Gestion en Eau : Cas du Sous Bassin Versant du N'zi (Centre-Est de la Côte D'ivoire en Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0561/20 (61.05.2020)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The last sentence of abstract must be changed.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some elements will be added; see my comments in the text (methods section)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I have some comments concerning the body of the paper principally in the section ‘‘Discussion’’. Some elements have to be take in account to perfect discussion. Please see my comments in the text for discussion section.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Some internet references have to be added like : http://webgr.irstea.fr/modeles/mensuel-gr2m/ https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02626667.2015.1112394?src=recsys	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The authors of this paper must take into account some important comments and questions concerning methodology and discussion to enhance the quality of this article.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: DE LASME OMER Z.	Email:
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: June / 08 / 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June / 11 / 2020
Manuscript Title: <i>Modélisation de la Relation Pluie-Débit à Partir du Modèle GR dans un Contexte de Gestion en Eau : Cas du Sous Bassin Versant du N'zi en Côte D'ivoire</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Not mentioned in paper received	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	4.5/5
<i>Title must be performed due to expression "à partir" which means "from... to". I suggest authors to use "à l' aide de". That expression avoids confusion about possible application in using of GR models. Indeed, by saying "from GR " it would mean that authors started their study by GR model and have continued until generate a new model or modified previous used.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4/5
<i>Methods and results are clearly presented and can be resume better. However, only result about fractures as a pathway of surface water was not argued in this paper. Consequently, this conclusion should be avoided. Also, some sentences need to be performed with precisions for better understanding. For example, in first sentence of abstract, Relationship of rain-runoff modelling is the main object of this study, but authors relied it to its context. Again, the optimal parameters were "determined" by modelling development, but authors have written those parameters have been identified.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4/5
<i>Yes, there is little grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Author can refer to revised paper joined</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4/5
<i>Database was clearly presented and submitted to critical process. Methodology is the same with original authors works. Nethertheless, authors did not presented duration of getting started in their application of GR2M and GR4J models.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5/5
<i>Body of paper is easy to read due to correct titles and subtitles for essential parts of work : introduction-methodology-results-discussion-conclusion</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5/5
<i>Conclusion relies on content summary and it finishes with relevant upcoming work :solve water management by combining its results with proved climate scenario models.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5/5
<i>Reference are comprehensive and appropriate but can be actualize more with latest ones in field of research</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):

See my suggestion of sentences in attached revised paper

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Evaluation criteria form can be performed by added line about the level of scientific problem pertinence studied.