

Manuscript: “**Local Population’s Knowledge And Perceptions On The Biodiversity And Conservation Status Of Land Snails In The Region Of Lamto Reserve At The Centre Of Ivory Coast**”

Submitted: 24 May 2021

Accepted: 01 July 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Konan Pacôme Pokou

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p241

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniel B. N. Kenko, University of Buea, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Benabdelmoumene Fatna, Abou Bakr Belkaid University, Tlemcen, Algeria

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Daniel B. N. Kenko	
University/Country: University of Buea / Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/05/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/05/2021
Manuscript Title: Local population’s knowledge and perceptions on the biodiversity and conservation status of land snails in the region of Lamto Reserve (central of Côte d’Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0611/21	
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>The title is clear and easy to understand but when going through the manuscript, some of the aspects mentioned in the title are not well developed</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Many key results are not mentioned in the abstract. The abstract is very scanty. An introductory sentence is needed at the beginning of the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are many grammatical errors especially with conjugation. Further proof-reading needed.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The survey with questionnaires is clear but methods related to snail sampling is not clear</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Results are poorly presented. Tables have been converted into pictures. Details are needed on snail abundance in the study sites</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion is accurate and reflects the content of the paper.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references style of the journal has not been followed. There are many old references; the authors should make use of recent literature to support their work.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See comments in the manuscript

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: BENABDELMOUMENE Fatna	
University/Country: Abou Bakr Belkaid University, Tlemcen, Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/05/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/06/2021
Manuscript Title: Local population's knowledge and perceptions on the biodiversity and conservation status of land snails in the region of Lamto Reserve (central of Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0611/21	
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.	4
<i>Yes</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The summary is clear and crisp.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The article is well written</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods perfectly written and explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear whose biostatistics treatment allows them to be well represented.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is short, clear and sums up the work well.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The bibliographical references are all recent and numerous.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I would like to thank you for this very relevant and original work
The best of wishes for the future.