

Manuscript: “**Étude comparative des peuplements ichtyologiques de l’Aire Marine Protégée de Joal-Fadiouth et des pêcheries des zones du pourtour non protégées à l’exploitation halieutique**”

Submitted: 31 March 2021

Accepted: 04 May 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Serigne Modou Sarr

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p133

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mamadou Ndiaye, UCAD, Senegal

Reviewer 2: Farokh Niass, Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis, Senegal

Reviewer 3: Sanogo Souleymane, Université Nazi Boni

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Mamadou NDIAYE	
University/Country: UCAD/Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/04/2021
Manuscript Title: Comparative study of the ichthyological populations of the Jaol-Fadiouth Marine Protected Area and the fisheries of areas not protected from fishing exploitation	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0439/41	
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 information in this article fits well with the title of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

<i>Nothing to report. Everything is well arranged</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some very minor grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>RAS</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Excellent</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Well done</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Excellent</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Apart from congratulating the author on the quality of his work; nothing else to report

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Farokh NIASS	
University/Country: Université Gaston Berger de Saint-Louis/ Senegal	
Date Manuscript Received: April, 10 th 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Étude comparative des peuplements ichtyologiques de l’Aire Marine Protégée de Joal-Fadiouth et des pêcheries des zones non protégées à l’exploitation halieutique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.04.2021	
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: Yee	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Ce serait bien de préciser qu’il s’agit de pêcheries autour de l’Aire Marine Protégée, le titre devient alors : «Étude comparative des peuplements ichtyologiques de l’Aire Marine Protégée de Joal-Fadiouth et des pêcheries des zones du pourtour non protégées à l’exploitation halieutique »	
Ceci permet de donner l’information que le papier traite de la comparaison entre l’Aire marine protégée de Joal-Fadiouth et seulement son pourtour et non pas des	

<p>autres pêcheries lointaines.</p> <p>It would be nice to clarify that these are fisheries around the Marine Protected Area, the title then becomes:</p> <p>« Comparative study of the ichthyological populations of the Protected Marine Area of Joal-Fadiouth and of the fisheries of the surrounding areas not protected from fishing exploitation »</p> <p>This gives the information that the paper deals with the comparison between the Marine Protected Area of Joal-Fadiouth and only its periphery and not other distant fisheries.</p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	
<p>Les résultats découlant de l'analyse ne sont pas bien mis en exergue dans le résumé. En effet, à la fin du résumé les auteurs ont dit : « L'analyse de paramètres physico-chimiques, des indicateurs de biodiversité à savoir : la richesse spécifique, les indices de diversité de Shannon-Weaver et d'équitabilité Pielou ont permis de déterminer les caractéristiques environnementales, la composition et la nature des peuplements, d'évaluer l'impact des mesures de gestion des différentes zones. » mais ils n'ont pas dit la nature des peuplements et ils n'ont rien dit sur l'impact des mesures de gestion.</p> <p>The results of the analysis are not well highlighted in the summary. In fact, at the end of the summary, the authors say, "The analysis of Physico-chemical parameters, biodiversity indicators such as species richness, the Shannon-Weaver diversity index and the Pielou equitability index allowed us to determine the environmental characteristics, the composition and the nature of the populations, and to evaluate the impact of the management measures of the different areas." However, they did not say the nature of the communities and they did not say anything about the impact of management measures.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	
<p>Il y a quelques fautes que j'ai corrigées directement sur le manuscrit.</p> <p>I corrected a few mistakes directly on the manuscript.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>La méthodologie est clairement exposée.</p> <p>The methodology is clearly stated</p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Les résultats sont clairement exposés.</p> <p>The results are clearly displayed.</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les conclusions sont précises et corrobore le contenu.	
The conclusions are precise and corroborate the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les références sont complètes	
References are complete	

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):

- Complete the abstract with the main results of the analysis.
- Complete Tables 7 & 8 with the meaning of sigles in colum “Catégories trophiques”

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: SANOGO Souleymane	
University/Country: Université Nazi BONI	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/04/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/04/2021
Manuscript Title: Étude comparative des peuplements ichtyologiques de l'Aire Marine Protégée de Jaol-Fadiouth et des pêcheries des zones non protégées à l'exploitation halieutique	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39042021	
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.	5
Ok	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
It would be interesting to add results in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
No major errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Ok</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>no methodology in the results</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Ok</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The authors' names are not in italics.</i>	

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):

My suggestions are on the manuscripts