

Paper: “Diversité et Distribution du Peuplement Ichtyofaune dans l'Estuaire de Betsiboka, Nord-Ouest de Madagascar”

Submitted: 23 February 2024

Accepted: 11 March 2024

Published: 31 March 2024

Corresponding Author: Benjamin Tsirilaza

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p162](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n9p162)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akpatcho H. Leon
Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin

Reviewer 2: Michael Konan
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Léon Hounkpéalodo AKPATCHO	
University/Country: Parakou (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 29/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/03/2024
Manuscript Title: Diversité des poissons dans l'estuaire de Betsiboka, Nord-ouest de Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0315/24	
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.	3,5
<i>(A word is missing from the title to indicate that the study concerns the variation in the level of fish diversity in the study environment)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The summary does not include a summary of the overall methodology but briefly addresses sampling</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4,5
<i>No comments</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1,5
<i>The analysis models should be clearly specified. For each index, state its importance, the formula for its estimation in the material and method section. Take care to reference these developments.</i> <i>The sources of the various tables and figures must be specified. Also, it is not appropriate to present tables in image form.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Graphics should be black and white for ease of use for readers.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>No comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The bibliographic reference is poorly developed. Difference in quotation names: 20xx. and (20xx).</i> <i>Some statements have not been referenced/</i> <i>The scientific interest of the study can be better justified.</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):

To properly elaborate the part on the classification of fish species, I recommend this article: Akpatcho, H. L., Crinot, G., Sinha, M., Adegbola, P. Y., & Yabi, J.

A. (2022). Analyse de l'évolution de la typologie des exploitations cotonnières engagées dans la transition agroécologique au Bénin et pratiques agroécologiques. Agronomie Africaine, 34(3), 479-491. The different models are well specified and the methodology too. Certain modifications were directly suggested in tracked modification mode in the document that I am returning to you

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: KONAN Ekoun Michaël	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 29 / 02 / 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 05 / 03 / 2024
Manuscript Title: Diversité des poissons dans l'estuaire de Betsiboka, Nord-ouest de Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0315/24	
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.	5
<i>Le titre est concis, clair et reflète le contenu du manuscrit</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Le contexte de l'étude mérite d'être mieux explicité de résumé</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Il y a eu un gros effort de relecture car il n'y a presque pas de faute. Cependant, certaines tournures de phrases devraient être revues</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p><i>Au niveau de la méthodologie, il serait souhaitable de préciser les différentes techniques de pêche et les outils utilisés pour la pêche artisanale.</i></p> <p><i>Les références de certains guides ou clés d'identification ne sont pas précisées ;</i></p> <p><i>L'auteur doit également justifier pourquoi il a choisi de réaliser les pêches expérimentales en octobre 2021 et en avril 2022. Si cela est lié à la saison alors il doit donner plus de détails sur les saisons du milieu d'étude.</i></p> <p><i>Il serait également préférable de renseigner les différentes formules utilisées pour le calcul des indices écologiques</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<p><i>Je souhaite que l'auteur produise dans les résultats les abondances des poissons car cela intervient dans le calcul des indices de diversité notamment l'indice de Shannon-Weaver.</i></p> <p><i>Le tableau présenté dans les résultats doit contenir les noms vernaculaires des espèces puisque les inventaires se sont fait sur cette base.</i></p> <p><i>Je suggère également que le statut de menace de chacune des espèces figure dans le tableau ;</i></p> <p><i>Je suggère à l'auteur de supprimer le tableau comparatif présenté dans la discussion et qu'en lieu et place, il discute ses résultats sur la base d'autres études réalisés sur le même site ou ailleurs dans le pays, références bibliographiques à l'appui.</i></p> <p><i>L'auteur doit également discuter ces résultats en tenant compte des exigences écologiques des différentes espèces de poissons notamment leur sensibilité au sel.</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Rien à signaler</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>L'auteur devrait fournir plus de références bibliographiques et surtout des références plus récentes.</i>	

Par ailleurs une référence citée dans le texte ne figure pas sur la liste des références bibliographiques.

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):

Le sujet traité est d'intérêt scientifique et concerne la gestion durable de la biodiversité. Les résultats obtenus sont importants. Cependant le manuscrit tel que présenté devrait prendre en compte les observations indiquées. Ces observations ont pour seul objectif de contribuer à l'amélioration du manuscrit. J'invite l'auteur à tenir compte de celles-ci et à me contacter au besoin.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je donne un avis favorable pour la publication du manuscrit après la prise en compte des observations suggérées.