

Paper: “State of Knowledge on Beekeeping Practices in Côte d'Ivoire in the Face of Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of Climate Change”

Submitted: 19 July 2023

Accepted: 24 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Salimata Ouattara

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p46](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p46)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniel Nkontcheuc
University of Buea, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Eduardo Neptali Colina Navarrete
Universidad Técnica de Babahoyo, Ecuador

Reviewer 4: Coulibaly Gninwélé Anne-Edwige
Felix Houphouet Boigny University, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

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: 27-09-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 02-10-2023
Manuscript Title: <i>State of knowledge on beekeeping in Côte d'Ivoire: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable productivity of the sector in the context of climate change</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: review 0804/23	
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.	5
The title meets the parameter.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The summary is not complete since it does not determine what methodology was used and in a certain way what the real results were.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are grammatical errors that make part of the text difficult to understand, these must be corrected.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
In general, the study methods comply with what is indicated.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Corrections must be made to the results, especially with a statistical part of writing.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Although the conclusions are supported to a certain extent, improving the statistical part of the document will improve the quality of the conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Is fulfilled	

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):

Make the requested changes by adding the pertinent information and add more if deemed necessary.

Successes

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Check that the proposed changes are executed as they will improve the quality of the text.

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: Daniel Brice Kenko Nkontcheu	
University/Country: University of Buea / Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/09/2023
Manuscript Title: State of knowledge on beekeeping in Côte d'Ivoire: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable productivity of the sector in the context of climate change	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0804/2023	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Very long title and should be summarized. The title should clearly indicate that it is a review.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Very short and should be updated</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>The whole manuscript should be proof-read for grammar and spelling. Scientific names are poorly written.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology is clear and easy to understand.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear and coherent</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions reflects the goals with good recommendations to stakeholders</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are up to date and the total number is acceptable for a review.</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):

None

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None

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: Coulibaly Gninwélé Anne-Edwige	
University/Country: Felix Houphouet Boigny University, Abidjan (Ivory Coast)	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/10/2023
Manuscript Title: State of knowledge on beekeeping in Côte d'Ivoire: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable productivity of the sector in the context of climate change	
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
The title is clear, however should be limited to “State of knowledge on beekeeping in Côte d'Ivoire: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable productivity of the sector” because climate change has not been developed.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The abstract is not well written, more like an introduction. The methodology is not explained and the results are not presented.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The searches were carried out from March to May 2022 and the beginning of 2023: What month does the beginning of 2023 correspond to? Give the article selection criteria.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Review the formatting of references	

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):

The document is well written overall. However, the authors should review the placement of figures and tables. In the bibliographic reference section, authors should review the formatting, some authors' names or sometimes titles are in italics; some references are not complete. Harmonize references and use the APA system.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: