

Manuscript: “**Characterization of the Ichthyological Population of Hydrosystemes in the Lagoon Area of the Azagny National Park (Ivory Coast)**”

Submitted: 06 September 2021

Accepted: 08 November 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Touplé Sibiri Koné

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n40p138

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Gileard Minja, Mwenge Catholic University, Tanzania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Gogbé Marius

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: Dr. Gileard Minja	
University/Country: Mwenge Catholic University, Tanzania	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/10/2021
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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
The title is satisfactory	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Yes the abstract is very good. However, the problem should be stated clearly, objectives of the study and methodology need to be expanded. Otherwise the	

results are very clear in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The English language is very good	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methods are well presented and described accordingly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear and are presented in acceptable format. The pie chart in Figure two need some adjustment enlarged to fit in the words. The discussion section is well presented based on the findings	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Well summarized	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Appropriate and up-to date.</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):

You may consider revise the abstract and include the comments suggested above.

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: 18/10/21	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Characterization of the ichthyological population of hydrosystems in the lagoon area of the Azagny National Park (Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64092021	
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 is clear and concise Yes	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract provides informations on the methods used for sampling, objectives and importants results of the study.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are very few grammatical mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
the methodology is adapted to the topic treated	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are linked to objectives	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion presents the important results of the specific objective of this study which is the characterization of ichthyological population of lagoon area of Azagny National Park.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are appropriate	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

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: October 18, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: November 03, 2021
Manuscript Title: Characterization of the ichthyological population of hydrosystems in the lagoon area of the Azagny National Park (Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64.09.2021	
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: 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.	4
<i>(The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article but "population" should be replaced by "fauna")</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The abstract is not structured as recommended: objects, methods and results)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(The language level is acceptable)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(The authors used the classical method usually used)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are well presented and clear but the titles in the text need to be corrected (refer to the manuscript)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(refer to the manuscript)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Good)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

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