

Manuscript: “**Ethnozoologie De Balearica Pavonina (Grue Couronnée) Dans La Vallée Du Fleuve Niger: Cas Du Barrage De Kandadji**”

Submitted: 27 January 2020

Accepted: 16 March 2020

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Dr. Soumaila Hassane

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p150

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dr. Alomasso A. Alphonse,
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2019

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/01/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/01/2020
Manuscript Title: Ethnozoology of Balearica pavanina (crowned crane) in the valley of the Niger river. Case of the dam kandadji	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 51.02.2020	
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 published version 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title corresponds to the content	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the summary does not correctly state the objectives. The mode of reproduction	

and the typology of the habitat was not specified. some results are to be reviewed	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Document well written and pleasant to read	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the methodology deserves to be more detailed	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The document is clear and contains very little error.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the conclusion must be more substantiated, it must show the scientific contribution of this study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> overall the references are well presented. but it is important to delete those that have not been mentioned in the text	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic discussed in this article is quite interesting, this article deserves to be published after taking into account the suggestions that have been made

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2019

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. ALOMASSO A. Alphonse	Email:
University/Country: Université de Parakou / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Ethnozoologie de Balearica pavanina (grue couronnée) dans la vallée du fleuve Niger. Cas du barrage de Kandadji. Ethnozoology of Balearica pavanina (crowned crane) in the valley of the Niger river. Case of the dam kandadji	
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 published version 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.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le Titre du document est bien Clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No much	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> YES	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> yes but too much	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	YES
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

NO Comments

