



Paper: “Etat des lieux de la biodiversité et de la dynamique écologique des communautés piscicoles du Lac Madarounfa (Niger)”

Submitted: 06 February 2025

Accepted: 03 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Yacouba Hamadou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n15p194

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gabriel Mukabo Okito
Institut Supérieur de Pêche de Goma (Ispê-Goma), RDC

Reviewer 2: Ahodègnon Alomasso
Université de Parakou, Benin

Reviewer 3: Rosaire Agbo-Tchotcho
Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC), République du Bénin

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: MUKABO OKITO Gabriel	
University/Country: INSTITUT SUPERIEUR DE PECHE DE GOMA (ISPê-GOMA) / RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/03/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/03/2025
Manuscript Title: Etat des lieux de la diversité et de la dynamique des communautés piscicoles du Lac Madarounfa (Niger).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0257/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4/5 (Very Good)
<i>The title is relevant and accurately reflects the primary objective of the study. However, it could be slightly reformulated to incorporate terms such as “ecology” or “biodiversity,” which would enhance its scientific scope and appeal. The title is relevant and accurately reflects the primary objective of the study. However, it could be slightly reformulated to incorporate terms such as “ecology” or “biodiversity,” which would enhance its scientific scope and appeal.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4/5 (Very Good)
<i>The abstract clearly presents the objective, methods, and main findings of the study. Nevertheless, it would benefit from the addition of a statement highlighting the importance of</i>	

<i>the research for the conservation of aquatic resources. Moreover, the use of technical terms such as diversity indices could be clarified to ensure accessibility for non-specialist readers. In addition, although the authors mention the duration of the study, they do not specify the exact start and end dates of the sampling period. Providing these details would enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the research.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3/5 (Good)
<i>While the manuscript is generally understandable, several grammatical and spelling errors remain. For example, the phrase “measured and weighed” could be reformulated to avoid redundancy. A thorough proofreading is necessary to correct these issues and improve the overall fluency and readability of the text.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3/5 (Good)
<i>The methods are clearly explained and well detailed. The multi-method approach employed for species inventory is appropriately justified, and the description of fishing gear and collection protocols is adequate. It may be helpful to include additional information regarding sample size and the criteria used for selecting sampling stations.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3/5 (Good)
<i>The results are clearly presented, with useful statistical analyses. However, there is a lack of discussion on the significance of the diversity indices. For instance, why might a moderate diversity level and poor distribution of individuals be concerning for resource management? Addressing this would add depth to the interpretation of the findings.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3/5 (Good)
<i>The conclusions are generally precise and supported by the data. However, expanding the discussion to highlight the implications of these findings for aquatic resource management and fish fauna conservation would strengthen the manuscript.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3/5 (Good)
<i>The references are appropriate and cover a wide range of relevant studies. Nonetheless, the inclusion of more recent references (published after 2019) would enhance the study’s credibility and contemporaneity. Additionally, certain references should be contextualized to explain their relevance to this study.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	3/5 (Good)
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- *Improve the clarity and fluency of the text by addressing grammatical and spelling errors.*
- *Provide a more in-depth discussion on the implications of the results for aquatic resource management.*

- *Broaden the conclusions to further explore the consequences for biodiversity conservation.*
- *Add recent references to strengthen the relevance and up-to-date nature of the study.*
- *Enhance the clarity and fluency of the text by correcting grammatical and spelling errors.*
- *Improve sentence structure: some sentences are overly long and may be difficult to comprehend. Consider breaking them down or rephrasing them for better readability.*
- *Add a concluding sentence to the abstract that highlights the significance of these findings for the sustainable management of fishery resources.*
- *Include a more comprehensive discussion on the implications of the results for aquatic resource management, emphasizing their relevance to current conservation strategies.*
- *Expand the conclusion section to further explore the broader consequences of the findings for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem health.*
- *Incorporate recent references to strengthen the study's relevance and demonstrate engagement with current scientific literature.*
- *Provide additional analyses: consider applying statistical tests, such as ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis tests, to compare species diversity across different stations or seasons, thereby enhancing the robustness of the findings.*
- *Offer a more in-depth interpretation of the results: specifically, discuss the meaning of the diversity and equitability indices in the context of Lake Madarounfa and its fish communities.*
- *Elaborate on how these findings can inform and guide local aquatic resource management decisions, with practical recommendations where possible.*
- *Include a discussion on the potential consequences of low equitability on fish population dynamics and community stability, addressing possible risks to ecosystem resilience.*
- *Regarding visual elements (tables and figures): in addition to Figure 1, the inclusion of summary tables presenting the identified species, their abundances, and ecological characteristics would enrich the presentation of the results. For instance, a table displaying diversity and equitability indices by station would provide valuable insight.*
- *Interpret the results more thoroughly: the authors should deepen their interpretation by discussing both the ecological implications and the relevance for resource management. Why are these results important for conservation efforts? How do they compare with data from other lakes in the region?*
- *Consider environmental factors: adding a section that addresses potential environmental variables influencing ichthyological diversity would strengthen the analysis. For example, the impact of seasonality on species diversity or the effects of fishing pressure could be explored to provide a more comprehensive understanding.*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: 15 Avril 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 Avril 2025
Manuscript Title: Etat des lieux de la diversité et de la dynamique des communautés piscicoles du Lac Madarounfa (Niger).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 57.02.2025	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Le titre de l'article est clair, sans équivoque et concis.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>Le résumé précise l'objectif de la recherche, la méthode adoptée et présente les principaux résultats obtenus.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Les auteurs sont invités à relire attentivement les texte pour rectifier les différentes fautes grammaticales et orthographiques qu'il contient.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>La méthode d'étude est clairement décrite.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats sont présentés dans tableaux et figures. Mais ces derniers ne sont pas commentés pour faciliter leur compréhension.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion résume bien le contenu de l'article</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les auteurs sont invités à choisir et appliquer correctement une seule et même norme bibliographique dans tout le document.</i>	

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):

Il est recommandé aux auteurs de choisir et appliquer correctement une seule et même norme bibliographique dans tout le document ; de préciser la source des tableaux et de les commenter ; de revoir la mise en forme du document en uniformisant la taille, l'interligne la couleur et la police des textes ; d'intégrer dans le document les photos des différentes espèces de poissons trouver dans le lac Madarounfa.