

Manuscript: “**Epidemiology of Gill Monogenean Parasites Infections in Nile Tilapia Oreochromis Niloticus (Teleostei: Cichlidae) from Agneby River, Côte d’Ivoire**”

**Submitted: 22 June 2021**

**Accepted: 15 September 2021**

**Published: 31 August 2021**

Corresponding Author: Adou-Blahoua Yedehi Euphrasie

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p30

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Blinded

**Reviewer 2:** Cinaria Albadri, Trinity College Dublin University, Ireland

# 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: Dr. Cinaria Albadri	
University/Country: Trinity College Dublin University, Ireland	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/08/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Epidemiology of gill Monogenean parasites infections in Nile Tilapia <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Teleostei : Cichlid) from Agneby river, Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 22.07.2021	
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>
The title is clear with appropriate structure and adequate to the content of the article. However, it is appropriate to rephrase as: ‘Epidemiology of monogenean gill parasite infections in Nile Tilapia <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Teleostei : Cichlid) from Agneby river, Côte d’Ivoire’.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract summarizes most of the study, and clearly presents the objects, methods and key findings with an appropriate length (182 words). The abstract lacks the structure of the subheadings (Purpose, Methods, Results and Conclusion) according to the journal guidelines. The abstract requires review and correction of few grammatical errors.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The paper is clear and well organized, however, there are grammatical and spelling mistakes that require revise by the author/s	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
Description of methods is well described according to the research’s nature, purpose and design. Random sampling was effectively employed in data gathering and resulted in clear fulfilment of the research aims. The sampling size and time of research conducting were clearly specified.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The results were explained in chronological order and the data presented in tables. Results section clear of any grammatical or spelling errors.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Requires review by the author. Conclusion is concise.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
References are appropriate and comprehensive.	

**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):**

- Minor corrections are required, as suggested above.
- Include limitations for this study, if any.

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

- Can be accepted for publishing after completion of corrections by author as this article is clearly to be a student's own work.
- The review of the literature is thorough so the reader will be given an adequate background about the topic.