

**Paper: “Diversity and abundance of birds devastating rice-growing in the town of Daloa and its outskirts (Centre-West, Cote d'Ivoire)”**

**Submitted: 29 June 2024**

**Accepted: 25 September 2024**

**Published: 30 September 2024**

Corresponding Author: Gnininté Maxime Zéan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p67](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p67)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tahiri Sylla

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Ghosh Nabarun

West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 3: Djadjiti Namla

Nile University of Nigeria, Nigeria

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024**

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: 14/08/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/08/2024
Manuscript Title: Diversity and abundance of birds devastating rice-growing in the town of Daloa and its outskirts (Centre-West, Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11.25.07.2024 (1)	
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.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [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>The title is expressive of what the paper contains.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The Abstract is clear and adequate</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Spell-chek and gramma-chek need to be done</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The methods used are appropriate for this type of study.</i>	

<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No errors in the results. Reference all Tables in the text</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The work is remarkable. No comments</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<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	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**No comments and suggestions**

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

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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: Djadjiti NAMLA	
University/Country: Nile University of Nigeria/ Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/09/2024
Manuscript Title: Diversity and abundance of birds devastating rice-growing in the town of Daloa and its outskirts (Centre-West, Cote d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: N/A	
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>The title is clear enough—and adequately reflects the content of the present manuscript.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract effectively presents the principal objective, methods, and results of the study. However, authors should consider mentioning the implications of the findings or recommendations based on the results (briefly).</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are a few grammatical and spelling errors in the present article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Each method employed in this work is explained clearly, providing sufficient details for the reader to understand the procedures followed.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The results are presented clearly, with detailed tables and statistical analyses supporting the findings. However, some sections require further clarification, particularly regarding the interpretation of statistical results (kindly see my comments). Overall, the body of the manuscript (especially the discussion) has some clunky sentences (e.g., L208-210 "This could be explained by the specific ecology of these species notably by the fact that they are gregarious and above all sedentary species on all our study sites").</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the content of the present article.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The cited references in the paper span several decades including foundational research and current studies. This is appropriate for a study of this nature, which benefits from both historical context and contemporary insights. However, only 32 out of the 33 references listed are cited within the manuscript. "Ahon D. B. (2016)" is listed but not included in the body of the work.</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):**

Effective interaction between bird populations and agricultural activities is crucial for sustainable pest management. Allou and co aimed to investigate the diversity and abundance of birds that damage rice crops in Daloa, a town located in the Centre-West region of Côte d'Ivoire, to identify species involved, understand their population dynamics, and evaluate their impact on rice production. To better refer to the comments, line numbering is needed (please go to layout, select line numbers and click on continuous). Here are my comments attached:

**Comment 1.** In your abstract, briefly mention the implications of the findings or recommendations based on the results.

**Comment 2.** A thorough review for grammatical correctness, clarity, and conciseness is recommended. This would greatly enhance the overall readability and professionalism of the document. Because there is repeated information (unnecessarily) across paragraphs, awkward phrases (e.g., rice devastating birds), minor grammatical errors (such as missing articles (e.g., "a" or "the"), and incorrect verb tenses, inconsistent use of technical terminology (“**Shannon-Weaver**” is the correct way to write Shannon-Wiever) throughout the manuscript, and unclear expressions (especially from the methods and results sections).

**Comment 3.** Further details on the statistical analysis and the specific criteria for selecting observation points should be clearly stated (for more clarity: discuss why the observed patterns are important, how these features compared to previous studies, and what they mean for the bird populations and agricultural practices).

**Comment 4.** The significance level (p-value) of 0.29 for species richness and 0.07 for species abundance indicates a lack of significant differences between study sites. Hence, you should consider discussing the ecological homogeneity or variability of the study area (slightly like comment 3.).

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