

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_93856
Title of the Manuscript:	Gears and modes of exploitation of edible frogs in the peri-urban localities of Man (Côte d'Ivoire)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Acknowledgments and competing interest must be added	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT PART</p> <p>Aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No need of writing "The exploitation of frogs has increased in recent years in several areas of Côte d'Ivoire. In the region of Tonpki in the west of the Côte d'Ivoire, these amphibians are used to fill the deficits in animal proteins of the populations" simply focus on the aim <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is entirely a recommendation; please try to briefly summarize and conclude on it <p>Key words: repeated two times</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Well written but lacks an elaborated literature review so add some more <p>Material and methods</p> <p>Study area: needs a reference for the data Data analysis method are not clearly stated</p> <p>Results : good</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A sentence like "The most used technique was arrow fishing (57.1%)" are a repetition of results so better to avoid it ➤ In discussion and conclusion part we did not see the effect of different harvesting system or not clearly stated the problem and its solutions. it is simply a bunch of findings. It must be revisited 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Tsegaye Adane
Department, University & Country	Woldia University, Ethiopia