

Manuscript: “**Caractérisation De La Diversité, De La Structure Des Tailles Et Du Stress Écologique Au Niveau Du Peuplement Des Poissons Sur Le Fleuve Bandama (Côte d’Ivoire, Afrique De l’Ouest)**”

Submitted: 20 September 2021

Accepted: 28 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Kouassi Brahim Kien

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p260

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouyaté Kassoum, Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny de Cocody (Abidjan/Côte d’Ivoire)

Reviewer 2: KOUADIO Akissi Nathalie, Ecole Normale Supérieure Abidjan/ Ivory Coast

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: Kouyaté Kassoum	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny de Cocody (Abidjan/Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/09/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/09/2021
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation de la diversité et niveau d'exploitation des poissons sur le fleuve Bandama (Côte d'Ivoire, Afrique)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.10.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ 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: Yes/ 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.	3
Le titre n'est pas totalement en adéquation avec le contenu du manuscrit car la partie « exploitation des poissons » n'est pas abordée.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Le résumé est clair et a présenté les objectifs, la méthodologie et les résultats.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Le texte est écrit avec un bon niveau de langue, facile à lire avec moins de fautes grammaticales et de mots sautés.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
La méthodologie est claire et les parties matériel et méthode bien explicitées.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats sont clairs et conformes.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Cette partie est bien rédigée.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références sont suffisantes, actualisées et appropriées par rapport au texte.	

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):

L'auteur doit apporter les corrections mineures et ajouter la partie exploitation des poissons.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'éditeur peut publier l'article après corrections du manuscrit.

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: KOUADIO Akissi Nathalie	Email:
University/Country: Ecole Normale Supérieure Abidjan/ Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 th December 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 th December 2021
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation de la diversité, de la structure des tailles et du stress écologique au niveau du peuplement des poissons sur le fleuve Bandama (Côte d’Ivoire, Afrique de l’Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1020/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/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: Yes/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.	5
The title is clear and in accordance with the content of the manuscript.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
Yes the abstract clearly presents the objectives, methodology and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The authors have taken care to enter all the corrections due to the first reading. The text is written with a good level of language, easy to read with very few errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is clear and the material is well indicated as the method is well	

explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear and consistent.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes, the conclusions or abstract are accurate and well supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are sufficient, up-to-date and appropriate to the text.	

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):

Authors should make two small corrections and review spacing before publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The editor can publish the article after corrections to the manuscript.