



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_50810
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF QUATERNARY SEDIMENTS OF QUARTZ GRAINS APPLIED TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT OF SOME IVORY BEACHES EAST OF ABIDJAN (CÔTE D'IVOIRE)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/sdi-general-editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is of good quality, the reading is fluent and the issue is of great relevance to the current context. The study provides about the morphoscopic and exoscopic analysis of quartz grains collected on the beaches of the gulf of Guinea. The authors use binocular magnifying glass and Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM), because this approach makes it possible to interpret traces related to events (energy level) or environments (transport, transition and storage environments). The results indicate that the quartz grains have a continental and marine origin. It is important to note the observation made by the authors that: "during this study, it was impossible to find two identical grains of sand", emphasizing the infinity of information that each of these quartz grains carries with them.</p> <p>This is true for all light blue background figures: The figures are fine, but the white scales that appear just below the figures appear to be superimposed over other images. It seems that a larger scale was placed over another smaller size scale, but the effect was not good. Can you make it better? The scale bars are also in trouble. They appear to have been overlapped over other bars and the effect was confusing.</p>	On the scales, they are the same scales. In fact the scale provided by the MEB is not very visible. So we reproduced the same scale so that it is visible
Minor REVISION comments	An overview of the English language is recommended. We recommend doing a scan on all text.	we have revised the language
Optional/General comments	I recommend the publication of this manuscript after passing through a minor revision.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript