

**Paper: “State of the Art and Contribution to the Documentation on Fishing, Aquaculture and on the Microbiological Profile of *Clarias Gariepinus* and *Oreochromis Niloticus* Two Species of Fish Reared in the Whedos of the Upper Ouémé Delta in the Republic of Benin”**

**Submitted: 09 August 2023**

**Accepted: 16 September 2023**

**Published: 30 September 2023**

Corresponding Author: Nicéphore Mensan Glodjinon

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p108

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olotu Titilayo  
Kent State University, Ohio, USA

Reviewer 2: Amal Atiyah  
College of Pharmacy/University of Babylon, Iraq

# 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:	
University/Country: Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>State of the art and contribution to the documentation on fishing, aquaculture and on the microbiological profile of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> and <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> two species of fish reared in the whedos of the upper Ouémé delta in the Republic of Benin.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 29---39.08.2023	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>1</b>

<i>The title is too length, its best if its average of 15-18 words</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Low percentage plagiarism</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>It a review, it contains information on antibiotic types, mechanism of action which is not associated with the topic. More information on <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> and <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> should be supplied.</b>	
<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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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



## 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: <b>Prof. Dr. Amal Talib Al Sa'ady</b>	
University/Country: <b>College of Pharmacy/University of Babylon, Iraq</b>	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>31/8/2023</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>State of the art and contribution to the documentation on fishing, aquaculture and on the microbiological profile of <i>Clarias gariepinus</i> and <i>Oreochromis niloticus</i> two species of fish reared in the whedos of the upper Ouémé delta in the Republic of Benin.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0839-23</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

### 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>
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References should be written in a uniform style according to the journal's instructions., Please make sure about the publication details (volum - issue - pages) and add the "doi" if any.</li> <li>Some references have not citation in the text of the article, although they are in the list of references.</li> <li>Many references are cited in the text but are not included in the references list.</li> </ul>	

**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):**

- There are comments have been included in the file, please take them into consideration by the author.
- References should be written in a uniform style according to the journal's instructions., Please make sure about the publication details (volume - issue - pages) and add the "doi" if any.
- Some references have not citation in the text of the article, although they are in the list of references.
- Many references are cited in the text but are not included in the references list.

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

