

Paper: “Dynamique de la Population de *Sarda sarda* (Bloch, 1793) du Golfe de Guinée, Côte d’Ivoire”

**Submitted: 15 August 2024**

**Accepted: 04 November 2024**

**Published: 30 November 2024**

Corresponding Author: Angui Kouamé Jean Paul

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p317

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pagadjovongo Adama Silue  
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Bouah Enoutchy Fabrice  
Felix Houphouët-Boigny University, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Innocent Djegbe  
École Normale Supérieure (ENS) de Natitingou, Benin

Reviewer 4: Yatanan Ble  
University of MAN, Côte d’Ivoire

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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: SILUE Pagadjovongo Adama	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 01-10-2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 06-10-2024
Manuscript Title: Dynamique De La Population De <i>Sarda sarda</i> (Bloch, 1793) Du Golfe De Guinée, Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 70.08.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Oui	

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

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

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
Le résumé n'est pas bien structuré. Les parties méthodologie et objectifs de l'étude doivent être intégrés et les principaux résultats obtenus doivent être étoffés.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
L'article contient des fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe mineurs qu'il faudra corriger	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Les résultats sont clairement exposés mais contiennent de petites confusions et fautes d'orthographe qu'il faudra corriger. Certains résultats méritent d'être illustrés par des graphiques.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
La conclusion reflète le contenu de l'article mais mérite d'être étoffée	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Les références sont conformes à la thématique.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

Le manuscrit doit être strictement uniforme (taille et police) et conforme au format de la revue EJS.

L'Introduction doit situer l'intérêt de votre travail, les enjeux et poser la problématique, en étayant vos propos par des références récentes et issues de périodiques (revues ou journaux spécialisés).

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. *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: Dr BOUAH Enoutchy Fabrice	
University/Country: Felix Houphouët-Boigny University	
Date Manuscript Received: 22 / 10 / 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 / 10 / 2024
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0870/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    yes, if required	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

## Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title accurately reflects the manuscript’s focus on the population dynamics of Sarda sarda in the Gulf of Guinea, making it easy to identify the article's subject.	

<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract summarizes the objectives, methods, and main findings well, though it could benefit from a slight expansion to include more details about the statistical methods used.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Overall, the language is clear with minor grammatical errors, which do not hinder comprehension. Proofreading is recommended for improved readability.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
The methods are well-detailed, covering both data collection and analytical processes (e.g., the FiSAT II software for parameter estimation) in a way that supports reproducibility.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
Results are clearly stated, with sufficient statistical analysis and well-illustrated figures, particularly in sections covering mortality rates and growth parameters.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Conclusions logically follow from the data presented, especially the implications regarding exploitation and stock sustainability.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
The references cover relevant previous studies and methodologies, particularly in fisheries biology and stock management.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The manuscript provides valuable insights into the dynamics of *Sarda sarda* populations in the Gulf of Guinea, an essential contribution to fisheries management. Minor grammatical corrections would enhance clarity, and expanding on the abstract's methodological section could benefit readers.

**Data consistency and clarity:**

Ensure consistency of data tables and figures, especially recruitment percentages, catch sizes and mortality rates, to improve readability and accessibility of information.

Titles of all tables and figures should be comprehensive, including units, data sources and relevant headings, to avoid ambiguity. Some values, such as lengths and mortality rates, may require clarification of units of measurement (e.g. cm for length, per year for mortality rates).

**Technical terminology and units :**

Standardize terms related to fishing and population dynamics to maintain clarity. For example, refer consistently to “L50” or “size at first capture” and ensure that these terms are defined when first introduced.

Check and apply consistent units for biological parameters such as growth rate (K), mortality rates (Z, M, F) and exploitation rates (E) to avoid reader confusion.

**Grammar and style:**

Streamline complex sentences, especially in sections explaining statistical models or biological interpretations, to improve readability.

Formatting and visual structure:

Improve alignment and spacing within tables to ensure that all columns are clearly separated and easy to interpret.

Ensure that figure legends are positioned consistently and provide sufficient context on each visualization without requiring the reader to search the document for explanations.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024***

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. ***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:
<b>Manuscript Title: <i>Dynamique De La Population De Sarda sarda (Bloch, 1793) Du Golfe De Guinée, Côte d’Ivoire</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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 “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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Le contenu du manuscrit est en accord avec le titre propose par les auteurs mais ceci pourrait être amélioré</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>Les objectifs et la méthodologie ne sont pas bien présentés et ne sont pas accrocheurs. Il manqué aussi de précision sur les résultats</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Le manuscript est bien rédigé, cependant il existe quelques fautes et formulation qui ne facilitent la compréhension du texte</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>La méthodologie est restée laconique, il y a peu de détails</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>La présentation des résultats pose un problème. Les auteurs devront revoir leur manière de présenter les résultats pour faciliter la compréhension aux lecteurs</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>LA conclusion est en adéquation avec le contenu du texte mais les auteurs devront se focaliser sur les résultats de leur recherche</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Oui mais nécessite un reformatage</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**les auteurs devront prendre en compte toutes les observations mentionnées sur le manuscript pour améliorer la qualité de l'article avant sa publication**