

Manuscript: “**Variabilité Pluviométrique Dans La Région De Katiola Au Nord De La Côte D’ivoire (Afrique De l’Ouest)**”

Submitted: 23 September 2020

Accepted: 24 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Franck Maxime Gnamba

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p169

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Yabi Ibouaïma,  
Univ. of Abomey-Calavi / Bénin

**Reviewer 2:** Fossou N'guessan Marie- Rosine, Nangui Abrogoua

# ***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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 30-09-2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Variabilité, rupture dans le régime pluviométrique depuis la fin des années 60 en Afrique de l’Ouest: cas de la région de Katiola au nord de la côte d’ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 35.10.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b> /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>2</b>
<b>J’ai fait une suggestion de titre aux auteurs (voir le manuscrit)</b>	
<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>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Des suggestions ont été faites aux auteurs pour améliorer dans ce sens</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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

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

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

Le titre du manuscrit devra être revu (voir la suggestion). L'introduction mérite d'être renforcée en exploitant les travaux les plus récents sur la problématique notamment les derniers rapports de GIEC. L'approche méthodologique mérite d'être retouchée (enlever les redondances et convoquer d'autres outils ou analyses. Les auteurs pourront relire le manuscrit pour en corriger les coquilles de frappe et de style.

# ***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: Fossou N'guessan Marie-Rosine	Email:
University/Country: Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
<b>Manuscript Title: Variabilité, rupture dans le régime pluviométrique depuis la fin des années 60 en Afrique de l'Ouest: cas de la région de Katiola au nord de la côte d'ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [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>Clair mais un peu long</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</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>Voire commentaire dans l'article</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</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>Voire commentaire dans l'article</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</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):**