

Manuscript: “**Caractérisation Spatiotemporelle Et Analyse De La Tendence Des Températures Au Sénégal**”

Submitted: 19 October 2020

Accepted: 19 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Demba Gaye

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p105

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** N'guessan Fabrice Kouassi  
University AlassaneOuattara de Bouaké

**Reviewer 2:** Alomasso  
Université de Parakou/Bénin

**Reviewer 3:** Basson Fiacre  
Université Joseph KI-ZERBO/Burkina Faso

# ***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: KOUASSI N'GuessanFabrice	Email:
University/Country: University Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké	
Date Manuscript Received: 26-10-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02-11-2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse de la tendance des températures au Sénégal sur la période 1960 à 2015	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13.11.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /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>	<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>	<b>3</b>
<i>1. Le titre de l'article est clair et adapté. 2. Cependant, les titres des sections sont à revoir. Ils sont non expressifs et inadaptés au contenu des textes.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>_ Objectifs et méthodes bien présentés _ Quelques insuffisances à revoir</i>	

_ Les principaux résultats obtenus dans l'étude ne sont pas littéralement présentés.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Il y a quelques fautes grammaticales et orthographiques.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>La méthodologie n'est pas clairement expliquée. Il faudra la structurer.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les textes sont justifiés. Parfois, les unités de mesure et autres ne se démarquent pas des chiffres qui les accompagnent.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>La conclusion est correctement rédigée. Toutefois, elle présente des carences liées aux résultats.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont bien présentées. Ils restent quelques ajustements à effectuer.</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):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

- Donner les objectifs spécifiques de l'étude
- Structurer (matériel et méthodes)
- Présenter les principaux résultats selon les différents objectifs spécifiques

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Toutes les remarques doivent être prises en compte avant la publication.

# ***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: ALOMASSO	Email:
University/Country: Université de Parakou / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/010/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 05/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse de la tendance des températures au Sénégal sur la période 1960 à 2015	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>YES</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>NO</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>YES</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>TO REVIEW</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

# ***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: BASSON Fiacre	Email:
University/Country: Université Joseph KI-ZERBO/Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Analyse de la tendance des températures au Sénégal sur la période 1960 à 2015	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1113/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

Avant tout propos, je voudrais féliciter les auteurs pour la qualité de ce manuscrit qui est digeste et agréable à lire. Cependant, les observations suivantes ont été relevées : (i) la restructuration de la partie 2. Matériels et méthodologie, (ii) le manque de l'analyse des tendances pour les différentes variables (températures) pour chaque station météorologique . Y a til une homogénéité ou hétérogénéité entre les stations et qu'est ce qui explique cela et (iii) l'absence de l'analyse des tendances futures des températures et aussi la perception des populations sur les tendances de ces températures et les options d'adaptations observées (ce point soit mentionné comme perspective ou faire cette analyse complémentaire à intégrer dans la partie résultats) Cela servira d'orientations pour les prises de décisions en faveur des populations vulnérables

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

/////