

Paper: “Qualité trophique des étangs piscicoles dans la region d’Azaguié Abey (Côte d’Ivoire) à partir des taxons phytoplanctoniques”

Submitted: 22 July 2024

Accepted: 28 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Estelle Sévérine Konan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p140](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p140)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Willy Lusasi Swana
Université de Kinshasa (UNIKIN), Kinshasa XI, R.D Congo

Reviewer 2: Ngueguim Fabrice
University of Douala, Cameroon

Reviewer 3: Jean Baptiste Aman
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

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

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results

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

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Many sentences need to be rephrased to be comprehensible

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly

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

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

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

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

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is complete and appropriate, but must be presented according to the journal's instructions.

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]

3

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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Le titre est clair mais pouvait être légèrement réaménager.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé doit décrire brièvement les objectifs, la méthode et les résultats quantifiés de la recherche

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

Les auteurs doivent revoir les fautes d'orthographe et de formulation relevées dans le corps du texte

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie du travail n'est pas bien élucidée. Les auteurs doivent fournir beaucoup d'effort quant à ce. Le mieux serait de présenter la méthodologie de chaque partie d'une manière Claire

Les auteurs sont appelés à revoir le point sur l'analyse et traitement statistique des données et retraiter certains résultats avec calcul d'écart-type et l'application d'un test statistique.

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

Les résultats ne sont pas bien présentés à certains endroits.

L'ordre de la présentation des résultats doit suivre la logique ou l'ordre de chaque point de la méthodologie.

Beaucoup de fautes ont été relevées.

Les auteurs doivent prendre en compte toutes les remarques faites dans le manuscrit afin de faciliter la lecture et la compréhension du document.

Les auteurs sont appelés à bien argumenter les résultats des paramètres physico-chimiques

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

Les auteurs sont appelés à reformuler la conclusion en y intégrant les approches sur les perspectives dans le sens de la durabilité et viabilité des étangs étudiés.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Les références ne sont pas conformes aux recommandations du guide des auteurs de la revue.

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]

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]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La thématique développée a une très grande importance dans la pisciculture et la gestion des écosystèmes aquatiques. Cependant, pour faciliter la lecture, la compréhension et une bonne vulgarisation des résultats de la présente recherche, il serait intéressant que les auteurs puissent :

- Restructurer les phrases et corriger les fautes d'orthographiques ;
- Interpréter et Discuter d'avantages les résultats obtenus suivant le titre et objectifs de la recherche.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

the title is not clear, need to be more specific. the author can talk about Qualité trophique des étangs piscicoles dans la région d'Azaguié Abey (Côte d'Ivoire) à partir des taxons phytoplanctoniques. Précisez également l'espèce de poisson

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

it will be useful to indicate the methods used

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes the methods are explained. but there is no mention if physicochemical parameter and observations of phytoplacton was done according to various development stage of fish. there is a lack of reference in the methodology.

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

based on your topic, phytoplantons organisation should be presented before physicochemical parameters. this because, it is those parameters which can explained or not the various taxons of phytoplantcon observed.

Discussion is not well done. physicochemical paramaters should be discuss according to various development stage of fish and used to explained the observed phytoplantcon, as well as the trophic state.

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

conclusion should be reformulate related to the new discussion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Updating some references will be good.

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]

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]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

the work has a great importance on fish farming and environmental impact. So, it's important to explain the correlation between the various components for a better understanding. In other to put in place adequate measures to protect our environment while producing fish for consumption.
