

Paper: **“Bibliographic Review of Aquaponic Systems and their Relevance to Côte d’Ivoire, a Sub-Saharan African Country”**

**Submitted: 01 September 2023**

**Accepted: 27 March 2024**

**Published: 30 April 2024**

Corresponding Author: Kouakou Barthélemy Koffi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p63](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p63)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arun N. Ghosh  
West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Just a few. I corrected some of them.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

No! There is no Methodology Chapter! It is missing and it should be written.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Just a few small errors. I mentioned them in the paper text.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

There are some small problems. I mentioned them in the paper. The references and their mentions in the text should be checked carefully.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

All the comments and suggestions are in the paper text.

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Needs revision, confusing on what exacting the authors are trying to establish!

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

OK

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Spelling, spacing, citations.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

This is a review paper with less original work.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Minor errors are there.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Not very relevant.

Needs more clarification on why this work was reviewed and what the authors are trying to establish!

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

OK. Needs proper organization.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

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

Please revise the paper thoroughly.

-----