

Manuscript: “**Evaluation de L’entomophagie dans Quatre Grandes Villes de Côte d’Ivoire**”

**Submitted: 28 August 2021**

**Accepted: 14 October 2021**

**Published: 31 October 2021**

Corresponding Author: Djédoux Maxime ANGAMAN

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p119

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Konan Georgette

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

# 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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 19/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/10/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Evaluation de l'entomophagie dans quatre grandes villes de Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0939/21	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. Just a detail should be added to the title in french to make sense.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
Details on survey method are not given (survey type, number of participants, etc.). A confusion is made on the last result presented.	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
There are few grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and inappropriate expression that should be considered by authors (see the reviewed manuscript)	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The study methods are not explained clearly. There are lacks of information of survey conditions (sampling, targeted populations, enrolment criteria and selection of participants).	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
The results are clear but contain errors: 1. No table exists for results related to insects-based foods. 2. Titles of tables are not clearly stated. 3. There are errors on figures annotations. 4. Results related to the consumed species are not appropriately reported. 5. The discussion of the results should be more deeply conducted.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The conclusions are supported by the content but the recall of the objectives of the study is not useful. Furthermore, as mentioned in the abstract, there is a confusion on the conclusion of consumed species.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
The references are comprehensive and appropriate. However, journal names should be harmonized: write all fully or shortly. Authors are also asked to follow the rules for written of scientific names of species.	

**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):**

The topic of the submitted study is relevant as alternative sources of protein are recommended nowadays to solve deficit of protein in the world. However, the manuscript contains some errors and lacks reported in the current evaluation form.

Therefore, authors are invited to review the paper according to the observations and suggestions before publishing it in ESJ.

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

The paper can be accepted for publication in ESJ but authors must review correctly regarding the comments on it before.

