

Manuscript: “**Socioeconomic and Cultural Importance of The Yellow-Fronted Canary (*Serinus Mozambicus*) in Northern Benin**”

Submitted: 07 August 2021

Accepted: 26 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Gildas AKUESON Gildas AKUESON

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p323](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p323)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Dr. N. Ghosh, West Texas A&M University, USA

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:	
University/Country: Federal University Wukari, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 th August, 2021
Manuscript Title: Socioeconomic and cultural importance of the Yellow-fronted canaries (<i>Serinus mozambicus</i>) in the Northern Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0865/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Respondents were purposely selected	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)Some references were not cited in the main text</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):

Respondents were purposely selected in your methodology. Please ensure your references were cited in your main text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript is publishable with or no corrections

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: Oct 11, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct 14, 2021
Manuscript Title: Socioeconomic and cultural importance of the Yellow-fronted canaries (<i>Serinus mozambicus</i>) in the Northern Benin	
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: No	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>This section should be revised. I provided some suggestions within the text</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes occurred in the documents. However, some suggestions are made in the document</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>None</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Some minor information could be provided for better understanding of readers (see comments in the manuscript)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
<i>Authors can make minor modification in this section as suggested in the manuscript</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>None</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

None; apart from taking into account suggestions and comments to improve the quality of the work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The manuscript is very interesting and can strongly contribute to an in-depth knowledge of *Serinus mozambicus* according to the modes of use by the local communities of Benin. However, the quality of this work can be improved through the comments and suggestions provided.

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. N. Ghosh	
University/Country: West Texas A&M University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: Oct. 17, 21	Date Review Report Submitted: Oct. 20, 2021
Manuscript Title: Socioeconomic and cultural importance of the Yellow-fronted canaries (<i>Serinus mozambicus</i>) in the Northern Benin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0865/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please read the reviewed manuscript and make the necessary corrections.