

Paper: “Analyse des pratiques de production et qualité des poissons fumés commercialisés au sud-Bénin”

Submitted: 24 November 2021

Accepted: 09 February 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Kowiou Aboudou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p154](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p154)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maouni Abdelfettah
Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Mensah T. Raouf
Université de Lomé/ Institut Togolais de Recherche Agronomique (ITRA), Togo

Reviewer 3: Aïssou C.B. Richmy
Centre de Recherche Agricoles en Horticulture, Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin

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: MAOUNI Abdelfettah	
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University/ Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:05/02/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/02/2022
Manuscript Title: Analyse des pratiques de production et qualité des poissons fumés commercialisées au sud-Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1227/21	
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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p>A revoir les numéros des figures et des tableaux:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Le tableau 2 présente les espèces de poisons: • Figure 1 : Récapitulatif des procédés de fumage de poisons importés (Chinchard, Maquereau) • Figure 2 : Récapitulatif des procédés de fumage du <i>clarias</i> • Figure 3 : Récapitulatif des procédés de fumage du <i>Tilapia</i> • Tableau 4 ? ou 4 a ??? <p>A revoir l'analyse statistique ANNOVA, les différences significatives avec les petites lettres sont contradictoire : Tableau 4a et 4</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p>A revoir:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10. Šašinka, Č., Stachoň, Z., Čeněk, J., Šašinková, A., Popelka S. & Ugwitz, P. (2021). • 11. Huss, H.H., Reilly, A. & Embarek, B.P.K. (2000). • 16. Hissein, O.A., Tapsoba, F., Guira, F., Zongo, C., Abakar, L.I & Tidjani, A. (2018). • 33. Lefèvre, F. & Bugeon. J. (2008). 	

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):

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 MENSAH T. Raouf	
University/Country: Université de Lomé/ Institut Togolais de Recherche Agronomique (ITRA), Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 mars 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31 mars 2022
Manuscript Title: Analyse des pratiques de production et qualité des poissons fumés commercialisées au sud-Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<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.	3
<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.	2
<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):

The few observations must be taken into account for the quality of the document, also review the references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 29 / 03 / 22	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 / 04 / 22
Manuscript Title: Analysis of production practices and quality of smoked fish marketed in southern 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: 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
The title does indeed relate the content of the manuscript. Nevertheless, it can be improved by this: Production practices and quality of smoked fish marketed in southern Benin	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The salient results of the study were well presented in this section according to the objective. The description of the methodology adopted facilitated the understanding of the study. However, some minor corrections should be integrated. (See manuscript in revision mode)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The writing style used makes the document easy to read and digest. However, some mistakes have been found in the revised file which the author should take into account for the scientific improvement of the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology used is well developed and the analytical methods used are well referenced. Also, the standards used to compare the results of this study are up-to-date.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The values obtained have been well presented so that the understanding of the results obtained is easy. The figures and tables presented are well illustrative. Nevertheless some mistakes were found and deserve to be corrected.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion effectively relates the synthesis of the results obtained during this study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The majority of the works cited in this manuscript are recent, which allowed for a good contextualization of this study. Also the references of these works were well presented according to the standards of reference presentation.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The theme addressed in this study is topical in a developing country such as Benin, where food insecurity reigns. Thus, this study is welcome to allow actors to improve their fish smoking practices in order to guarantee a good quality finished product for the benefit of consumers. The results obtained allowed the achievement of the objectives set as described in the manuscript. The latter contains some minor mistakes that deserve to be corrected for the improvement of the document. However, the perspectives announced at the

end of the study must be pursued to contribute more to the food security of the Beninese population.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

We sincerely thank the editors for involving us in the review of this manuscript. However, we remain available for possible new manuscripts to be evaluated in order to further contribute to the evolution of science.

Long live scientific collaboration!