

Paper: “Premières Données Sur la Communauté des Oiseaux du Lac de Barrage de Sologo, Département de Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 10 April 2023

Accepted: 18 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Jean Magloire Niamien

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p18

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ahy Nirindrainiarivony
Institut d’Enseignement Supérieur de Menabe, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Saint Quillaume Odoukpe
University Felix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 10/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Premières données sur la communauté des oiseaux du lac de barrage de Sologo (Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0463/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu du manuscrit	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

Le résumé est relativement bien structuré	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Peu de fautes grammaticales	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
La methodologie est bien expliquée, mais elle doit être ajoutée de la partie analyse statistique qui va être utiliser.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Les résultats sont bien présentés, cependant ils manquent de test statistique pour comparer les abondances au niveau des orders ou des familles.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
La conclusion et le résumé sont bien présentés et correspondent au contenu	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
La reference bibliographique ne se présente pas uniformement	

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):

Votre manuscrit est bon et ben structuré mais il y a un peu de problème de fond.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This work is well structured in terms of form but the authors will have to improve the result part by statistical analysis, as well as the reference part.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: ODOUKPE K. Saint Guillaume	
University/Country: Felix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY University (Côte d'Ivoire).	
Date Manuscript Received: August 26	Date Review Report Submitted: September 04
Manuscript Title: Premières données sur la communauté des oiseaux du lac de barrage de Sologo (Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0463-23	
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

<i>Yes.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The authors need to review the abstract according to my comments.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been corrected directly in the manuscript.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods are explained clearly but the authors need to make a few corrections.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear but contain a few errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes</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):

The authors must review the results. Some species are not distributed in Côte d'Ivoire. All observations are included in the manuscript.

