

Paper: "Seasonal variation in contamination of fish flesh of smoked and dried Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus (Lacépède, 1803) with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in the locality of Guessabo (Ivory Coast)"

Submitted: 21 December 2023

Accepted: 04 June 2024 Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Miessan Aya Pauline

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n18p68

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Erick Mibei

Reviewer 2: Kouassi Brahima Kien

Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Tahiri Sylla

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa, Côte d'Ivoire

# 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:	Date Review Report Submitted:	
Manuscript Title: Seasonal Contamination of Smoked and Dried Chrysichthys Nigrodigitatus (Lacépède, 1803) Meat with Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) in The Guessabo Locality		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13.01.2024		
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

(Please insert your comments)

I propose the author to give the English name of the fish in the title (if it is one fish species)/ or sawy fresh water fish

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3	
( <i>Please insert your comments</i> ) Mentions the statistical analyses carried out and talk of fish mongers not female smokers alone. Or did the study limit itself to female fish mongers alone?		
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4	
(Please insert your comments) There are very few grammatical errors which can be correcte reading.	d during proof	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4	
(Please insert your comments)		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3	
(Please insert your comments)  The presented results are clear though Fig 3 to be redone the page.	to fit the figures in	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
(Please insert your comments)		
The author to be careful with the interpretation of results fish; does it or doesn't it contain PHAs? Can it be said to PHAs then what could be the possible sources?	•	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
(Please insert your comments)		
The references are comprehensive		

### ${\bf Overall\ Recommendation\ (mark\ an\ X\ with\ your\ recommendation):}$

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

# 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: KIEN Kouassi Brahiman				
University/Country: Peleforo Gon Coulib	aly University			
Date Manuscript Received: 04/01/2024 Date Review Report Submitted: 15/01/2024				
Manuscript Title: Seasonal contamination of smoked and dried Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus (Lacépède, 1803) meat with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the Guessabo locality.				
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13.01.2024				
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No				
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No				
You approve, this review report is available in the	e "review history" of the paper: Yes/No			

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is clear but it should be said seasonal variation of conseasonal contamination	tamination instead of
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The summary is clear, presents the objectives, methodology army observations into account in the manuscript.	nd results but takes
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The text is written with a good level of language, easy to read grammatical errors and skipped words.	with fewer
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology is more or less clear, however there are clari in certain areas.	fications to be made
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The presentation of the results and the discussion deserves to be improved.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion and summary are accurate and supported by the	e content
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are sufficient, up-to-date and appropriate to the need to be adapted to the correction made.	text but they will

### **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):

The author must make the corrections suggested in the document to improve the quality of the manuscript before publication.

# 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: SYLLA Tahiri			
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé Daloa / Côte d'Ivoire			
Date Manuscript Received: 01/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/19/2024		
Manuscript Title: Seasonal contamination of smoked and dried Chrysichthys nigrodigitatus (Lacépède, 1803) meat with polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the Guessabo locality.			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13.01.2024 (2)			
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	ne "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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4

The title is expressive of what the paper contains (What country	)
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Ivory coast does not appear anywhere in the Abstract and there key word	fore cannot be a
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Spell-chek and gramma-chek need to be done	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Done properly)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(No errors in results)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(No comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
(Be sure to use the APA citation style in your paper)	

#### **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):**

Correct references to improve work Overall good work.

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