

Manuscript: “**Visites Touristiques et Comportements des Singes Sacrés de Gbetitapéa, Centre-Ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 13 August 2021

Accepted: 15 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Kouakou Yao Celestin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p181](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p181)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: : Kouassi Kouakou Simeon ,Université Félix Houphouet-Boign

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: KOUASSI	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Visites touristiques et comportements des singes sacrés de Gbetitapéa, Centre-ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Voir dans le texte.

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Visites touristiques et comportements des singes sacrés de Gbetitapéa, Centre-ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0876/21	
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.	3
<i>The title could be clearer. For example: Eco-ethological assessment of monkeys in the sacred forest of Gbetitapéa, in central Côte d'Ivoire: importance of human visits</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>It is necessary to specify the place of the study and to review the link between the monkeys and the forest concerned. Specify what is actually considered sacred: the forest or the monkeys or both. In the latter case, it must stand out. In addition, the methodology on how to quantify observed behaviours should be further clarified.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>The text deserves to be reformulated at several levels (see remarks in the manuscript). It is necessary to pay attention to the concept of "tourist" developed in the text. The general objective must be better presented even globally, in order to fully reflect the relevance of the subject. Having more knowledge on a topic may seem too vague and too common</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>Specify the parameters studied in the methodology, including the limits, so that it does not remain vague.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Favor scientific names in the text instead of common names that can nevertheless be indicated at the very beginning only. Some of the results presented are not sufficiently directly related to the methodology applied. This is the case of the behavior of monkeys in the absence of tourists. In addition, frequencies on an observed individual are not acceptable.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Pay attention to the time used in the summary. Instead, use action verbs. There are also many syntax errors. Better discuss the limitations of the study. In this case, the weakness of the results obtained on the number of certain species (see the commentary in the text).</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Review the indications on the number of pages of journals or works presented in bibliographic references</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
------------------------------	--

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an original study, but done too shortly. The parameters to be studied must be well defined in relation to the spirit of the population for the concept of "tourist". The results obtained for some species are too low and should in principle be expanded for better significance and credibility.

It is therefore necessary to consider an additional duration of observation of the behavior of the signs at the top of the tree tops. Otherwise, place strong emphasis on the limitations of this study.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The proposed article is quite original and can be accepted, if an additional observation and therefore information can be provided on monkeys through a larger accounting. It would be interesting and more appropriate to increase the number of certain observations of the behavior of the monkey species.

In addition, it would be good to review the ethological characterization of the behaviours used. As these behaviours are supported by sequences, a more detailed study of these could allow a better appreciation of the results obtained.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 16 August 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Visites touristiques et comportements des singes sacrés de Gbetitapéa, Centre-ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire / Tourist visits and behavior of the sacred monkeys of Gbetitapea, center-west Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0876/21	

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.	5
Nothing to note.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The authors must improve the methodological approach and list of key words by taking our suggestions into account.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Reformulations of sentences and ideas have been made in the text to avoid some repetitions.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Nothing to note.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Globally, the results are clear and very interesting even if some inputs from my side have been made.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Good conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are globally adapted to the research topic. They are not old, which shows a coherence in the contribution intended by the authors in the targeted research.	

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):

This study is interesting and it is line with the research on biodiversity. It highlights the importance of sacred sites for biodiversity conservation. However, the authors should avoid redundancy in giving information and ensure that sentences are synthesized for a better presentation of data.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Unquestionably, this study is of high quality. After taking into account the minor inputs made through the text, I think this paper should be publishable.