

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_129635
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of the ichthyological production of two hydrosystems, one under protection and the other free of access in Aby lagoon, Ivory Coast
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Fish stock assessment provide a lot of information about ecosystems status. This information provided is all the more valuable as it presents detailed information on the fishing activity and uses a methodology specific to the ecosystem studied. So, in this paper, we can only observe a quantitative evaluation of the fish production obtained by commercial fishing, which is intended to indicate the benefits of some protection zones (no-fishing zones). The importance of the scientific paper is given by its role in verifying a management measure put in place by the Ivory Coast authorities in Aby Lagoon.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate, but can be adjusted for clarity. Suggestion: " <i>The role of protected area fish management measures in the Aby Lagoon, Ivory Coast</i> "	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is detailed, but I suggest to present more clearly highlighting the purpose of the paper and its key contributions	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In general, the information presented in the paper presents scientific characteristics, but in terms of materials and methods, it is not clear from the map which are the protected areas, the nets used are not characterized from a technical point of view (length, width, height, mesh size, etc), the boats used for fishing, and how they fishing (1- 2 boats in same time, etc) For Resultes section perhaps using the comparison between the two areas studied (the protected and the fished areas) would make it easier for the readers if the graphs were presented in a mirror image. In Disscution Section the social and organizational explanations for the variation in the indicators studied are not so scientifically relevant even if they can be practically sound arguments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Bakiu, R., Beqiri, K., Konomi, A., Ziou, A., & Moutopoulos, D. K. (2022). Fisheries assessment of the Albanian lagoon fisheries. <i>Fisheries & Aquatic Life</i> , 30(2), 74-84. Koffi, B. K., Berté, S., & Koné, T. (2014). Length-weight relationships of 30 fish species in Aby Lagoon, Southeastern Côte d'Ivoire. <i>Current Research Journal of Biological Sciences</i> , 6(4), 173-178. Năstase, A., & Năvodaru, I. (2023). Dynamics of freshwater fish fauna and stocks in the Danube Delta, Romania. <i>Scientific Annals of the Danube Delta Institute</i> , 28, 149-168.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I strongly advise you to revise the manuscript, especially in terms of technical language	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Maria Desimira Stroe
Department, University & Country	Institute of Research and Development for Aquatic Ecolog, Fisheries and Aquaculture. Romania