

Paper: “Persistance des Séquences Pluvieuses et Risques d’Inondations de 1971 à 2022 en Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 16 December 2023

Accepted: 12 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Kolotioloma Alama Coulibaly

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p53](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p53)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lassana Traore

Institut Polytechnique Rural de Formation et de Recherche Appliquée, Mali

Reviewer 2: Melaine Mel

Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: MEL Mèlèdje Mélaine	
University/Country: Université Félix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Persistance des séquences pluvieuses et risque d'inondation en Côte d'Ivoire de 1971 à 2022	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17574	
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

<i>(Le titre est clairement mentionné. Il met en adéquation la persistance des pluies et la probabilité des innodations en Côte d'Ivoire. C'est un lien qui est relativement mis en evidence dans le manuscrit.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(La structuration du résumé est correcte. L'auteur présente un contexte, les objectifs la méthodologie et les résultats de l'étude.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Le niveau de langue et d'écriture est de bonne facture.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(L'auteur prend soin d'expliquer la procedure méthodologique. Laquelle se base sur des données de station météorologique et autre proceeds de Markov, Gumbel et analyses fréquentielles.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Les résultats présenté sont correctes.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(La conclusion ne fait que reprendre les grandes lignes en termes de résultats. Je trouve cela redondant.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Les références sont appropriées au sujet développé. Le seul soucis est la manière de presenter ces citations, lesquelles ont fait objet de critique dans le manuscrit.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 01/25/20224	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/28/2024
Manuscript Title: "A Persistence des séquences pluvieuses et risque d'inondation en Côte d'Ivoire de 1971 à 2022"	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree 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: 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.	5
<i>un peu d'ordre</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>Mais, l'abstrat manqué la conclusion et les perspectives de cette étude.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>L'article est très bien rédigé</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>La méthodologie est bien expliquée.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dans d'ensemble, l'article est très bien rédigé, mais il faut relire le document surtout le résumé pour éviter des petites fautes. La conclusion manque à leur résumé

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

J'apprécie beaucoup votre procédure de publication.