

Manuscript: “**Effet de la fertilisation organique des étangs à partir des fientes de poulets sur la survie et la croissance des alevins de *Oreochromis niloticus* (Linnaeus, 1758)**”

Submitted: 08 February 2021

Accepted: 31 March 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Amon Yao Nicolas

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n14p246

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Konan Kouassi Sylvain, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: KONAN KOUASSI SYLVAIN	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Effet de la fertilisation organique des étangs à partir des fientes de poulets sur la survie et la croissance des alevins de <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0332/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé présente toutes les parties bien définies	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques fautes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodoloie est bien expliquée, cependant, il fallait préciser si la fiente avait été préalablement compostée et si les 10kg/m ² /mois étaient disposées en une seule fois dans l'étang.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont clairs et san erreurs	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Bonne conclusion et bon résumé	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Références appropriées	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Des observations à prendre en considération ont été intégrées dans le texte.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: 05/03/21	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Effet de la fertilisation organique des étangs à partir des fientes de poulets sur la survie et la croissance des alevins de <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0332/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	4
the title and the article are adequate	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
the summary clearly describes the work with objectives, methods and results the work was done according to the scientific procedure	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
the article was written in a clear and simple language	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
the various methods used to obtain the results were well carried out according to the standards	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
the results of the experiments are clear and well presented according to the plan	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
the conclusion of this article is in correlation with the stated theme	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
bibliographical references are adapted and recent	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):