

Paper: “First Data of the Ichthyological Fauna in the Bandama River at the Lamto Scientific Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa)”

Submitted: 25 February 2023

Accepted: 21 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Adou-Blahoua Yedehi Euphrasie

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n18p190](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n18p190)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Erick Mibei
University of Kabianga, Kericho, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Ghosh Nabarun
West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 3: Tahiri Sylla
Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire

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: 24/04/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/04/2023
Manuscript Title: First data of the ichthyological fauna of the Bandama River at the Lamto Scientific nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
Delete the word First data and consider using the words; Profiling the ichthyological fauna of the Bandama River at the Lamto Scientific nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa)	

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.	3
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Prof. (DR.) N. Ghosh	
University/Country: West Texas A&M University	
Date Manuscript Received: 4.24.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 4.30.2023
Manuscript Title: First data of the ichthyological fauna of the Bandama River at the Lamto Scientific nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0308/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: XYes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: XYes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: XYes/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 results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Some of the sentences are to be restructured, consult a manuscript writer to best represent the research	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

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):

Some of the sentences are to be restructured, consult a manuscript writer to best represent the research

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Good work, but must be revised before publishing.**

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: SYLLA Tahiri	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/04/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/05/2023
Manuscript Title: First data of the ichthyological fauna of the Bandama River at the Lamto Scientific nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 08.03.2023	
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>The title is expressive of what the paper contains.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The Abstract is clear and adequate</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Spell-chek and gramma-chek need to be done</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods used are appropriate for this type of study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>No errors in the results. Reference all Tables and Figures in the text (Figure 1, Table 1, etc.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>No comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper</i>	

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):

Correct references to improve work
Overall good work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: