

Paper: “Reproduction de Bagrus bajad (Fabricius, 1775, Bagridae) du Lac Albert, Bassin du Nil, République Démocratique du Congo (RDC)”

Submitted: 18 October 2022

Accepted: 30 November 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Joseph Matunguru

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p77](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p77)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yannick Moloba

Reviewer 2: Akonkwa Desire

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: 11 Nov. 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14 Nov.2022
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	0
<i>There isn't conclusion and recommendations</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):

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: 14/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/11/2022
Manuscript Title: Reproduction de <i>Bagrus bajad</i> (Foskalil 1775, Bagridae) lac Albert, Bassin du Nil, République Démocratique du Congo (RDC)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>See comments in the attached manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Some interpretations need to be strengthened</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>The conclusion is missing</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes</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): To incorporate the proposed corrections in the annexed document.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: To check if the author has corrected the document before accepting the manuscript.