

**Paper: “État des Lieux de la Faune Sauvage Mammalienne dans le Département de Sipilou, Ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire”**

**Submitted: 17 October 2022**

**Accepted: 21 November 2022**

**Published: 30 November 2022**

Corresponding Author: Hilaire Kouakou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p76](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p76)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elie Bandama Bogui

Reviewer 2: Ahissa Laurent

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022***

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:	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 28 October 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/11/2022
<b>Manuscript Title: État des lieux de la faune sauvage mammalienne dans le département de Sipilou, Ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1107/22	
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:    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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Cet article traite de la moyenne et grande faune mammalienne. Cela n'apparaît pas dans le titre.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>Le résumé est bon mais quelques propositions de modifications méritent d'être prises en compte</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>Quelques aspects de la méthodologie méritent d'être clarifiés notamment le calcul des IKA. Les auteurs doivent clarifiés si les IKA ont été calculés en prenant en compte seulement des observations indirectes et/ou observations directes</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Ce travail qui présente une des rares fois l'état de la moyenne et grande faune mammalienne est original. Une clarification des différents commentaires/suggestions pourraient contribuer à améliorer la qualité de ce travail.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022***

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: 09/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/11/2022
Manuscript Title: État des lieux de la faune sauvage mammalienne dans le département de Sipilou, Ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43...07.11.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title of the article is informative and expresses the content of the whole manuscript.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The summary includes the different parts which are the context of the study, the objectives, the methods and the main results of the study.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
A few grammatical errors have been observed in the text, which we have corrected. These mistakes are not aberrations and do not call into question the credibility of the	

study.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The methods are clear enough to understand. Nevertheless, we have noticed some points that the authors should explain well.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>the results are clear and well arranged according to the objectives. Some observations have been made. The authors should take them into account.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusion is well written. It responds well to the introduction and the objectives</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>the references are well written on the whole.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

We had the pleasure to read this scientific document. We would like to congratulate the authors for this interesting work. Nevertheless, some observations made in the form and substance should be taken into account before the official publication

