

Paper: “Principales Maladies Zoonotiques des Porcs (*Sus scrofa domesticus*) à l’Abattoir de la Société Ivoirienne d’Abattage et de Charcuterie de Yopougon (Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 20 January 2023

Accepted: 18 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Jean Magloire Niamien

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n15p81

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Erick Virgile Azando
Université de Parakou, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Lambert Kouassi Konan
Institut Pasteur de Côte d'Ivoire

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: AZANDO Erick Virgile B.	
University/Country: Republic of Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 2023-03-16	Date Review Report Submitted: 2023-03-27
Manuscript Title: Principales maladies zoonotiques des porcs (<i>Sus scrofa domesticus</i>) à l'abattoir de la société ivoirienne d'abattage et de charcuterie de Youpougou (Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 08.02.2023 ?	
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.	Yes

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	Yes
<i>Les mots clés doivent être modifiés</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Yes
<i>Il y a beaucoup de fautes de grammaire, d'orthographe et de conjugaison. Nous avons essayé de les corriger directement dans le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	No
<p><i>L'analyse est trop superficielle. En réalité il n'y a pas eu de discussion. Les auteurs n'ont pas commenté leurs propres résultats avant de commencer à les comparer avec les résultats d'autres auteurs..</i></p> <p><i>Les collectes de données ayant duré 13 mois ce la signifie qu'on a traversé toutes les saisons. On devrait ressortir du tableau I les données de la saison des pluies qu'on va comparer avec celles de la saison sèche pour faire ressortir l'effet saison</i></p> <p><i>Il a manqué au tableau III la donnée sur le nombre de porcs abattus par localité. Elle est essentielle pour calculer la fréquence relative de chaque affection.</i></p> <p><i>Sur combien de porcs abattus à Bingerville on a décelé 133 cas d'échinococcose ?</i></p> <p><i>Sur combien de porcs abattus à Koun-Fao on a décelé 3 cas d'échinococcose ?</i></p> <p><i>Etant donné que ce ne sont pas les mêmes nombres de porcs qui sont abattus par localité, la fréquence relative des cas observés révèle mieux le problème de santé publique.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références ne sont pas respectées. En plus il y a 4 auteurs cités dans le texte mais qui ne sont pas référés dans la bibliographie puis 21 auteurs qui sont dans les références bibliographiques et absents dans le texte. Pourtant le manuscrit fait juste 12 pages</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Prendre en compte les corrections qui sont directement faites dans le texte

Faire ressortir l'effet saison à partir du tableau 1

Modérer les affirmations issues du tableau 3 après avoir calculé les fréquences relatives car ce ne sont pas les mêmes nombres de porcs qui sont abattus dans toutes les localités

Commenter vos propres résultats au regard de ce qu'on sait de la biologie, de la physiologie, des pathologies, ...avant de les comparer avec les résultats d'autres auteurs.

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 : 25 avril 2023	Date Review Report Submitted : 02 mai 2023
Manuscript Title : PRINCIPALES MALADIES ZOONOTIQUES DES PORCS (<i>Sus scrofa domesticus</i>) À L'ABATTOIR DE LA SOCIÉTÉ IVOIRIENNE D'ABATTAGE ET DE CHARCUTERIE DE YOPOUGON (ABIDJAN, CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number : 0208/23	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is in adequacy with the contents of the article. Indeed, 3 zoonotic diseases of pigs have been found at SIVAC in Yopougon	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The manuscript is well written with few grammatical and spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methods used to describe the study were well described and feasible	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There was a small error on the value of the number of echinococcosis is 541 instead of 591. The results highlighted the existence of 3 zoonotic diseases in the seized pigs. This is in accordance with the title and the methods used to highlight these zoonotic diseases. These results will allow the implementation of a surveillance at SIVAC	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is well supported and summarizes the results perfectly. It allows us to understand the objectives of the study	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Regarding the references, 4 are in the text but are not in the References. In the references section, 22 references present in the references do not appear in the text. The authors should rectify these inconsistencies. The references do not comply with the requirements given in the instructions to authors	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This work is interesting, but the references have not been mastered. We ask the authors to revise the references in order to harmonize them well

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Manuscript can be published if the authors agree to thoroughly review the references