

Manuscript: “**Length-Weight Relationship And Condition Factor Of Mangrove Fish Species In Azagny National Park (Grand-Lahou Department, Ivory Coast)**”

Submitted: 08 November 2021

Accepted: 28 January 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Kouadio Kouassi Alain

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p158

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kien Kouassi Brahiman, Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University / Ivory Coast

Reviewer 2: MKDK Piyaratne

Reviewer 3: Attoubé Ida MONNEY, Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé/ Côte d’Ivoire

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: Kien Kouassi Brahiman	Email:
University/Country: Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University / Ivory Coast	
Date Manuscript Received: 12 th November 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 17 th November 2021
Manuscript Title: Length-weight relationship and condition factor of mangrove fish species in Azagny National Park (Grand-Lahou department, Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1155/21	
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.	5
The title is totally in line with the content of the manuscript	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The summary is clear and presented the objectives, methodology and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The text is written with a good level of language, easy to read with fewer grammatical errors and skipped words.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methodology is clear and the material and method parts well explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear and consistent	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion seems insufficient to me. It will be necessary to relate the result of this study and the management of the fisheries as mentioned in the initial objective.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are sufficient, up-to-date and appropriate in relation to the text but they will have to be adapted to the instructions to the authors.	

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):

The author must make corrections to improve the quality of the document before publication

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The editor can publish the article after corrections to the manuscript.

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: 26.11 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Length-weight relationship and condition factor of mangrove fish species in Azagny National Park (Grand-Lahou department, Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1155/21	
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: 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>Title is clear enough</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Some errors are corrected in the manuscript itself. But need revisions</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Sources of the equations used in the methodology should be cited</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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.	4
<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):

Please cite the sources of all your equations, if not, a clear explanation about building of equation is required.

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: Attoubé Ida MONNEY	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Length-weight relationship and condition factor of mangrove fish species in Azagny National Park (Grand-Lahou department, Ivory Coast)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.11.2021	
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: 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
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are few grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methods are explained clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

The results are clear and contain few errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Conclusion is not enough	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are comprehensive and 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	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thank you to the authors for associating me for the revision of this manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I agree to revise this paper.