

Paper: “Study of the Population Variability of Two Chrysichthys Species in Six Aquatic Ecosystems in Côte d'Ivoire”

Submitted: 20 June 2023

Accepted: 19 October 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Coulibaly T.A.S.

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p254](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n30p254)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N'gbo Martin Luthère King
University of San Pedro, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Coulibaly Anne Edwige
Felix Houphouet Boigny University, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Martin Luthère King N'GBO	
University/Country: University of San Pedro / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: Sunday July 22, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: Monday July 22, 2023
Manuscript Title: Intra-population Variability of Two <i>Chrysichthys</i> Species in six Aquatic Ecosystemes of Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>the title clearly matches the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2,5
<i>the summary does not highlight the problem of the subject. In addition, the results are not mentioned there. finally, I would have liked the summary to end with a small conclusion.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>the language level is acceptable. No mistakes capable of affecting the meaning of the sentences.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>the average age of the fish selected for the study was not mentioned. the geographical location of the six hydrosystems has not been mentioned either. the methodology itself is acceptable.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Compared to the objective of the study which is to evaluate the morphological variability of the populations of two species of the genus Chrysichthys, I can say that the results were well presented overall.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>I appreciate the conclusion. it begins with a synthesis and ends with a perspective.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>All the authors present in the text are listed in the references section according to their order of appearance in the text.</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):

All my encouragement to the authors. I hope that for the next articles an accent will be put on the "summary" and the "material" part taking into account the remarks made.

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: Coulibaly Gninwélé Anne-Edwige	Email:
University/Country: Felix Houphouet Boigny University, Abidjan (Ivory Coast)	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/08/2023
Manuscript Title: Intra-population Variability of Two <i>Chrysichthys</i> Species in six Aquatic Ecosystemes of Côte d'Ivoire	
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.	4

Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Yes, on the whole.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Yes.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
The references in the reference section are badly written.	

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, authors should justify the choice of the genus *Chrysichthys* in the introduction. The problem and problematic related to *Chrysichthys* are not well perceived.

The references are very old. For example, in introduction: “Overexploitation of the sea and lagoon beds has led to the depletion of certain natural stocks (**Albaret and Laë, 2003**)”, 20 years later, are the waters overexploited? Is there no solution provided?

In the results, we suggest putting some illustrations of the analyzed fish.