

Paper: “Assessing the Quality of Shellfish Harvesting Areas: The Case of the Qualidia and Sidi Moussa Lagoons in Morocco”

Submitted: 19 December 2023

Accepted: 08 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: B. Khbaya

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p223](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p223)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Djadjiti Namla
Nile University of Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Gbe Kouakou N'dri Ange Konan
Félix Houphouët-Boigny University, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is clear and reflects the content of this article. It effectively communicates the focus of the study, which is the evaluation of sanitary conditions in Oualidia and Sidi Moussa Lagoons through microbiological and chemical monitoring over three years (2017-2019).

However, for further precision and clarity, the authors may consider including specific aspects such as "Shellfish Harvesting Areas" or "Implications for Oyster Farming" in the title, as these elements are central to the study. This could result in a title like "Assessment of Sanitary Conditions in Oualidia and Sidi Moussa Lagoons: Implications for Shellfish Harvesting Areas Based on Microbiological and Chemical Monitoring Results (2017-2019)."

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract of the article does provide a clear overview of the objectives, methods, and results of the study. The objective is presented clearly, with methods sufficiently describing the approach taken in the study. Overall, the abstract effectively communicates the main components of the study, providing a concise yet informative summary of the research.

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

The manuscript is well-written, with no grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. The language is clear, and the content is coherent and aligns with the subject area. Overall, this is a good piece of research, and the authors have put in a lot of effort to bring the manuscript to the current level.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods in the study are clearly explained. The section on Material and Methods provides detailed information on the characteristics of the study area, the sampling and analysis procedures, the assessment of the quality of the areas, and the statistical approaches used for monitoring frequency and trend analysis.

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

The information in the body of this present manuscript is presented in a clear and organized manner, and the language used is technical, which is suitable for a scientific audience. Each section in the body of the paper effectively communicates the study design, sampling procedures, and analytical methods mentioned in the abstract. However, the authors could do the following to improve the quality of the manuscript:

- Employ more advanced statistical techniques or machine learning algorithms to analyze the data. This would provide more nuanced insights and patterns that might not be apparent through

traditional statistical methods.

- To enhance the understanding of the dynamics of contamination in these lagoons, the authors could consider conducting a more detailed temporal analysis to identify trends or seasonal variations in contamination levels.
 - They could include analyses of certain environmental parameters such as temperature, and precipitation, that might influence contamination levels. This broader perspective could contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the ecosystem.
 - The researchers could also integrate a risk assessment component that considers not only the contamination levels but also the potential risks to human health associated with the consumption of shellfish from these areas.
 - They could also incorporate geospatial analysis to identify specific hotspots or areas within the lagoons that might be more prone to contamination and assess the potential public health impact of the contamination such as estimating the exposure and potential health risks for individuals consuming shellfish from these areas. However, this information would be valuable for targeted management strategies.
 - Finally, they could engage with local communities, fishermen, and other stakeholders to gather qualitative insights into the socio-economic impacts and perceptions related to the suspended oyster farming activity. Their input could complement the quantitative data.
- Overall, this is a good piece of research and the authors have put in a lot of effort to bring the manuscript to the current level.

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

The conclusion is supported by the data presented in the Results and Discussion section, which includes information on microbiological and chemical monitoring results for both lagoons during the period 2017–2019.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference section of the manuscript needs improvement. Based on the list of references, there are 23 citations, but from the body of the manuscript, there are more than that. Thus, there's a discrepancy, as not all in-text citations are present in the list of references, and vice versa. Additionally, most of the references are dated, suggesting a potential gap in incorporating recent developments in the field. To enhance the scholarly value, it would be advisable to include more recent references, ensuring the study aligns with the latest advancements and provides readers with up-to-date information in this research area.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

2

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]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

TITLE

The title effectively conveys the study's focus, but for added precision, consider incorporating elements like "Shellfish Harvesting Areas" or "Implications for Oyster Farming" to highlight the central aspects of the research.

Suggested Title: "Assessment of Sanitary Conditions in Oualidia and Sidi Moussa Lagoons: Implications for Shellfish Harvesting Areas Based on Microbiological and Chemical Monitoring Results (2017-2019)."

BODY OF THE PAPER

- Consider employing more advanced statistical techniques or machine learning algorithms for nuanced insights.
- Conduct a detailed temporal analysis to identify trends or seasonal variations in contamination levels.
- Include analyses of environmental parameters (e.g., temperature, precipitation) to understand their influence on contamination levels.
- Integrate a risk assessment component considering both contamination levels and potential health risks.
- Incorporate geospatial analysis to identify contamination hotspots and assess public health impact.
- Engage with local communities and stakeholders for qualitative insights into socio-economic impacts related to oyster farming.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Address the discrepancy between the number of citations in the body and the reference list. Include more recent references to enhance the study's scholarly value and align with the latest advancements in the field.

OVERALL

The research is commendable, but addressing the suggestions will further improve the manuscript's quality and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the study area.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The article's title is concise and fitting, providing an immediate understanding of the content. Its clarity enhances the article's appeal by accurately reflecting the discussed subject.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides clarity by concisely outlining the objective, method, and results of the study. Its transparent presentation facilitates a comprehensive understanding of the content.

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

There are a few errors to be corrected, but it does not detract from the quality of the work.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explicitly detailed, providing a clear understanding of the research process. Each step is carefully outlined, allowing for a transparent and rigorous approach in conducting the investigation. Methodological clarity enhances the credibility and reliability of the obtained results.

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

ok

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

ok

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is complete; however, the writing needs to comply with the requirements of the journal.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

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):
