

**Paper: “Détermination du Niveau de Contamination en Métaux Lourds (Arsenic, Cadmium, Mercure et Plomb) de Quatre Espèces de Poissons Consommées par les Familles de Pêcheurs de Jacqueline”**

**Submitted: 12 October 2023**

**Accepted: 05 January 2024**

**Published: 31 January 2024**

Corresponding Author: Diane N'Doua

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n3p53

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Soro Dramane  
Université Péléforo Gon Coulibaby, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Aboubacar Ouattara  
Univerité Alassane Ouattara de Bouake, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Joseph Yoka  
Université Marien Ngouabi, République du Congo

# 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: Dr OUATTARA Aboubacar	
University/Country: Univerité ALASSANE OUATTARA DE BOUAKE / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/10/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/10/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Détermination du niveau de contamination métallique (arsenic, cadmium, mercure et plomb) de quatre espèces de poissons consommées par les familles de pêcheurs de Jacqueline.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1053/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No : <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No : <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No : <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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Détermination du niveau de contamination en métaux lourds métallique (arsenic, cadmium, mercure et plomb) de quatre espèces de poissons consommées par les familles de pêcheurs de Jacquville.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>voir manuscrit</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Pas d'erreurs observées</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Voir manuscrit</b>	
<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>2,5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Several authors cited in the text are not on the list of bibliographical references</i>	

**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):**

Plusieurs auteurs cités dans le texte ne sont pas sur la liste des références bibliographiques.

Veillez revoir les références bibliographiques.

# 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: 20 november 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 november 2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Determination of the level of metal contamination (arsenic, cadmium, mercury and lead) of four species of fish consumed by fishing families in Jacquville.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 53.10.2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>Yes, the title is clear and appropriate for the content of the article. From the title, we already have an idea of the content of the article. As soon as we read the content, we automatically get the idea from the title.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objective of the study, the methods and the results. This is in line with the standard outline for the abstract.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>There are no grammatical or spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The study methods are explained, but some information lacks the bibliographical references to convince readers. The statistical processing of the data is not specified in this article. The authors of this article should specify all the sources of their methods, make them clearer and specify the statistical test used.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The results are clear, but contain a few errors of form. I was able to correct some errors directly in the text by colouring them green and others I put in red for the authors to correct.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Yes, the conclusion is correct; it highlights the main results and clearly states the scientific interest of the study. It is consistent with the results contained in the article. The same applies to the abstract.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The references are appropriate; they fit in well with the subject matter. However, they should be reviewed. From a substantive point of view, some of the references cited are not really bibliographical references, but statements of study methods. From a formal point of view, some of the references on the list are not cited in the text and there is one reference cited in the text but not on</b>	

**the list. The authors are obliged to tidy up this very important part of the work. I have specified all these observations in the document.**

**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):**

Authors are required to take into account all comments made in the document in order to improve the quality of their article. Comments underlined in green are corrections to be taken into account; those underlined in yellow are information to be completed and others in red are to be deleted or corrected.

In particular: in the introduction, the problem should be clearly stated; in the methods, the sources of certain methods and the type of statistical processing of the data should be specified; the references should be reviewed.

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

The editors are asked to forward their manuscript with all my comments to the authors and to ask them to take these comments into account in order to improve the scientific quality of their article. These are minor observations and once they have been taken into account, the article may be published.

# 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: SORO Dramane	
University/Country: Université Péléforo Gon Coulibaby/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 20-11-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 25-11-2023
Manuscript Title: Détermination du niveau de contamination métallique (arsenic, cadmium, mercure et plomb) de quatre espèces de poissons consommées par les familles de pêcheurs de Jacquville.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 53.10.2023	
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>5</b>

The title is clear and is adequate with the content.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>55</b>
The abstract is clearly presents objects, methods and results	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
This article is well written	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The study methods are clearly explained	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The results are clear	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions or summary are correctly write	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are appropriate.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

No, Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)

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

No, Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only