

**Paper: “Spatial distribution, abundance and infestation rate of freshwater intermediate host snails in Lake Kivu, DR Congo side”**

**Submitted: 04 June 2024**

**Accepted: 26 December 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mashimango Bagalwa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p221](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p221)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moulay Abdeljalil Ait Baamrane  
Faculty of Applied Sciences, Ibn Zohr University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Magda Davitashvili  
Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Adou-Blahoua Yedehi Euphrasie  
Nangui Abrogoua University, 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: Moulay Abdeljalil AIT BAAMRANE	
University/Country: Faculty of Applied Sciences, Ibn Zohr University - Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/06/2024
Manuscript Title: Spatial distribution and abundance of freshwater snails in Lake Kivu, DR Congo side	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0641/24	
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 "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.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
The title needs to be revised because the term Distribution causes some confusion between geographic distribution and temporal distribution or even with its real meaning in this work which is the presence or absence of the species	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>1</b>
The abstract must be thoroughly reformulated. The problem has not been addressed, and the methodology is not particularly exact. The results are incomplete and contain clear discrepancies.	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
The linguistic level of the paper is very poor and thus needs to be improved by a native English speaker.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The methodology is not convincing and needs to be improved and completed. Especially regarding the search and identification of parasites, the diversity index used and the statistical tests are not sufficient.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
The results presented are not exhaustive, do not adequately reflect the fieldwork effort carried out and contain several anomalies and contradictions.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>
The conclusion is very brief and does not add any value to the document as a whole.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
All the references cited in the text appear in the bibliographic list. small negative point, the references are in the majority very old	

**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):**

See the document

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

### 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: Magda Davitashvili	
University/Country: Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 06.06.2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Spatial distribution and abundance of freshwater snails in Lake Kivu, DR Congo side	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: I agree.	
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: I approve.	

#### 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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is reflecting the content of the paper in a clear and attractive way.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract is clear and correctly written. It contains all the important elements of the paper. It presents objects and results in a clear way.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

It would be nice if the author could reconsider the spelling issues.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are modern and appropriate. Methods are acceptable, reliable with sufficient information. They give the author of the article opportunity to achieve the set goals and objectives.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are presented in a clear and didactical way and contain sufficient data.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. The submitted article is relevant and meets the requirements of scientific articles. The article deserves publication.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The used bibliography is actualized, sufficient and well qualified. The list of references is comprehensive.	

**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):**

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