

**Paper: “Effet de l’incorporation de concentré alimentaire industriel dans la ration de poulet de souche locale dans la commune de Korhogo (Côte d’Ivoire)”**

**Submitted: 14 October 2024**

**Accepted: 29 November 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Kouadio Kouakou Parfait

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p86

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Khatouf Rachid

Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II, Rabat, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Kanambaye Boureima

Laboratoire d'Écologie Tropicale (LET) FST/IPR/IFRA de Katibougou

Reviewer 3: Joseph Yoka

Université Marien NGOUABI, République du Congo

Reviewer 4: Aboubacar Ouattara

Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, 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: Dr KHATOUF Rachid	
University/Country: <b>Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II, Rabat, Maroc</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>24/10/2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>29/10/2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Effet de l'incorporation de concentré alimentaire industriel dans la ration des poulets de souches locales sur les performances de croissance en claustration dans une basse cours en période de croissance dans la commune de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1065/24</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>OUI</b>	
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: <b>OUI</b>	

#### 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>4</b>
<i>Le titre est clair et reflète le contenu de l'article, mais, il est préférable de le reformuler pour que ça soit plus concis, moins long et plus pertinent. Le titre mentionne les souches locales (pluriels) alors que l'étude porte sur une seule souche précise. Eviter les erreurs d'orthographe sur le titre et dans l'article : basse cours : basse-cours ou bassecour.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>Oui, le résumé présente l'objectif, les méthodes et les résultats, mais, nécessite d'être révisé :</i>	
<i>Reformuler les objectifs de l'étude (4 premières lignes), 1- évitez les redondances, 2- il ne s'agit pas d'une voie alternative, mais d'une supplémentation de la ration 3- Dans le résumé, vous parlez de 96 poussins alors que dans l'article, vous parlez de 80, 4- les résultats : le gain de poids moyen du lot témoin est de 227,5g est supérieur à celui du lot avec le concentré 217g, l'indice de consommation du lot témoin 3,92 alors que celui du lot étudié est de 5,1 : ces résultats ne reflètent pas la conclusion retenue, veuillez et clarifiez.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il y a quelques erreurs d'orthographe, de grammaire, conjugaison et de formulation, il fait relire tous l'article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Oui, les méthodes utilisées sont bien expliquées, juste il faut vérifier et clarifier l'identification des lots (lot témoin qui servira de comparaison et lot étudié)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il faut clarifier l'identification des lots (lot témoin qui servira de comparaison et lot étudié) parce que ça porte confusion lors de lecture des résultats. le gain de poids moyen du lot témoin est de 227,5g est supérieur à celui du lot avec le concentré 217g, l'indice de consommation du lot témoin 3,92 alors que celui du lot étudié est de 5,1 : ces résultats ne reflètent pas la conclusion retenue, veuillez clarifier.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les conclusions ne reflètent pas les résultats obtenus, à moins qu'il y a eu une erreur sur l'identification des lots.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>Oui le nombre de références est acceptable pour une thématique peu abordée (souche locale)</i>	
<i>Mais certaines citations dans le texte n'existent pas sur la liste des références.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X X X X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Les auteurs doivent prendre en compte toutes les remarques, corriger les fautes d'orthographe, de grammaire et formulation et d'apporter les clarifications aux commentaires mentionnés.**

**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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 1 november 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 8 november 2024
<b>Manuscript Title: Effet de l'incorporation de concentré alimentaire industriel dans la ration des poulets de souches locales sur les performances de croissance en claustration dans une basse cours en période de croissance dans la commune de Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.10.2024	
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.

<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>
<b>Yes, the title is clear and appropriate for the content of the article. From the title, we already have an idea of the content of the article. As soon as we read the content, we automatically get the idea from the title.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objective of the study, the methods and the results. This is in line with the standard outline for the abstract. However, it lacks a little context before the objective.</b>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Yes, there are a few grammatical and spelling errors that we've corrected directly in the text, with writing in green.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>The study methods are clearly described, but are not supported by bibliographical references. We have made this observation in the text.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The results are clear and there are no errors.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Yes, the conclusion is correct; it highlights the main results and clearly states the scientific and technical interest of the study and the prospects for further research. The conclusion is consistent with the results contained in the article. The same applies to the abstract.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The references are appropriate but not complete. Some references are cited in the text but are not included in the list of references. Others are not cited in the text, but are included in the list of references. Improvements need to be made here. This observation is made directly in the text.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Authors are required to correct the manuscript taking into account all comments made as follows:

- writings in green are corrections made and must be accepted;
- writing in red should be deleted outright or deleted and replaced by writing in green;
- Yellow text refers to questions asked or improvements to be made.

The materials and methods section must be supported by bibliographical references.

In the list of references, include only those cited in the text.

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