



**Paper: “Caracterisation des peuplements ichtyologiques d’un hydrosysteme fluvial a Guessabo et lacustre a Buyo, Côte d’Ivoire”**

**Submitted: 22 January 2025**

**Accepted: 03 May 2025**

**Published: 31 May 2025**

Corresponding Author: Cisse Ibrahim Kalil

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n15p105

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nguiguim Fabrice  
University of Douala, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

yes, it is adequate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes, the abstract effectively presents the study's objects, methods, and results.

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

of course yes, there are a few examples of spelling errors I've observed: "ichthyometre" instead of "ichthyometer", "espèces estuarienne" instead of "espèces estuariennes", "Ciprinodontiformes" instead of "Cyprinodontiformes", "boulanger" instead of "Boulenger".

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

yes, the authors provide sufficient details for the reader to understand how the data was collected and analyzed.

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

The body of the paper is generally clear in terms of conveying the scientific information.

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

Yes, the conclusion is accurate and supported by the content of the article.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of references appears to be comprehensive and appropriate for this type of research.

***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]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

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

***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):**

Based on my review of the paper, here are some comments and suggestions for the authors for different parts of the paper :

Methods:

Acknowledge and discuss any potential biases introduced by using data from both commercial fisheries and experimental sampling. Explain how these biases were minimized or accounted for in the analysis.

Provide more detail on the specific statistical tests used. For example, specify which post-hoc tests were used after the Kruskal-Wallis test, if any.

Consider adding a brief justification for the chosen sampling methods. Why were those particular mesh sizes and gear types selected?

In the Discussion section, put a concern on the potential implications of the findings for fisheries management and conservation in the Sassandra River.

Comparison of your results with previous studies also means to clearly highlight both the similarities and differences, and provide possible explanations for any difference if possible, suggest directions for future research.

Figures :

Check that the units are clearly indicated in all figures and tables.

Improve the resolution of the figures if necessary.

-----