



**Paper: “Influence of Reproductive Rhythm and Weaning Age on Fertility and Body Condition of Local Breed Does in the District of Abidjan”**

Corresponding Author: Brahim Soro

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p247

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Afiademanyo Komlan Mawuli, University Of Lomé / Togo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

## ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: June 30, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: July 20, 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Influence of reproductive rate on the reproductive performances of local breed does in the district of Abidjan</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06100/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

### 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>
The title is adequate to the content but it would be preferable if there was no word repetition (i.e. reproductive). <b>I suggest you find a synonym</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes.</i> <i>However, the breeding rate (days) should be clearly indicated.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Some few mistakes</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The choice of the re-mating interval was not justified</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the discussion contains a plagiarism which should absolutely be corrected.</i>	

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Quite good</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>At least one cited author not included in References</i></li> <li>• <i>Unfortunately, studies performed under similar environmental conditions have not been cited</i></li> </ul>	

**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):**

**1. General comments**

The study deals with a subject of importance for tropical and developing countries (the challenge of improving productivity to feed a rapidly growing population). The originality of your work relates mainly to the model: i.e. local breed does and you have made a follow-up effort which has yielded interesting results.

Nevertheless, your work would be more interesting if you had compared your results **also** with works carried out on local breed does in the sub-region (notably in Nigeria and Ghana).

**2. Introduction**

For a better understanding of the targeted objectives, it would be necessary to indicate the current conduct of reproduction (reproduction rate) as practiced in the farms in your country or in the sub-region.

**3. Methods**

It would also be interesting to know why you chose this model when (I imagine) several other breeds are bred in the country.

**4. Discussion**

**Please note, it is forbidden to plagiarize another author. In fact, part of the text was taken verbatim from Feugier's thesis.**

Feugier, A. 2006. Une méthode alternative de reproduction chez la lapine : un modèle pour une approche systémique du fonctionnement des élevages cunicoles.

These parts of the discussion must be redone

**5. References**

Review all the authors cited in the text and in the References: not all are referenced and there is a mismatch in the year of publication.

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

**The discussion includes plagiarism.** However, the results seem good to me. Therefore, I give my consent for the publication of the paper, after correction