

**Paper: “Caractéristiques de la dynamique des Oiseaux d’eau sur le bras majeur de la Komadougou dans les Communes de Diffa et Gueskerou, (Niger)”**

**Submitted: 26 July 2022**

**Accepted: 28 November 2022**

**Published: 30 November 2022**

Corresponding Author: Youssoufa Issiaka

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p264](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p264)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ousmane Ndiaye, ENSA, UIDT, Senegal

Reviewer 2: ODOUKPE K. Saint Guillaume, Felix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY University (Côte d’Ivoire).

Reviewer 2: Abissa Antoine Yao

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022***

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: Ousmane Ndiaye	
University/Country: ENSA, UIDT, Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/01/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/11/22
Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques de la dynamique des Oiseaux d'eau sur le bras majeur de la Komadougou Yobé dans les Communes de Diffa et Gueskerou, (Niger)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04/11/08/22	
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>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Some are written try to see in red</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**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):**

Put the results of the KHI<sup>2</sup> test site and diversity parameters

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

Can be published but need to correct the p-value Table 2

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Caractéristiques de la dynamique des Oiseaux d'eau sur le bras majeur de la Komadougou-Yobé dans les Communes de Diffa et Gueskerou, (Niger)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04-11.08.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Après l'avoir lu dans le titre, Yobé n'apparaît plus dans le texte	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
Quelques petites corrections à faire au niveau du résumé	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

Quelques fautes d'orthographe don't j'ai corrigé la majorité. Par ailleurs votre travail est scientifique et non littéraire. C'est sur base que vous êtes jugés. Certaines tournures rendent difficile la compréhension.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
La méthodologie est un peu confuse car on ne sait pas comment vous avez identifié en termes d'espèces les oiseaux que vous avez entendu chanter. Est-ce que les cris sont spécifiques aux espèces ou aux genres ?	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Au niveau des résultats vous mettez des couleurs différentes sur certains chiffres sans toutefois mettre en légende ce que ça voudrait signifier. Votre discussion n'est pas assez pointue. Vous reprenez sous une autre forme la présentation des résultats. Ici vous devriez expliquer les raisons de vos résultats.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
RAS	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
Il faut harmoniser la façon de donner les références des auteurs.	

**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):**

Pas de commentaires

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

Pas de commentaires