

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.
