



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57239

Title: Use of zooplankton to diagnose the ecological quality of the waters of the Banco River South East of Ivory Coast

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....✓

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*).....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Clear objective focusing on ecological assessment using zooplankton
- Long study duration covering almost one year with seasonal variation
- Use of multiple sampling stations representing different conditions
- Standard methods used for physicochemical analysis and sampling
- Detailed identification of zooplankton taxa with large dataset
- Inclusion of statistical analysis such as Kruskal Wallis and Mann Whitney tests
- Use of ecological indices like Shannon index and C R ratio
- Good presentation of data through tables and figures across pages

Weakness of the study

- No mention of ethical approval or research permissions
- Language and grammar errors present in several sections
- Some inconsistencies in species count and data reporting
- Discussion section is lengthy but lacks clear critical analysis
- Figures and tables are dense and not always easy to interpret
- Limited explanation of ecological implications in practical terms
- No clear limitations section mentioned
- Some repetition in background and discussion parts

Reviewers Comments

This study addresses an important topic by using zooplankton as bioindicators to assess the ecological quality of the Banco River. The work is well structured with a clear objective and a comprehensive methodology that includes sampling across different seasons and stations. The data presented in tables and figures, especially on page 5 and page 8, provide detailed insights into physicochemical parameters and zooplankton diversity. The use of statistical tests and ecological indices strengthens the scientific approach. However, ethical clearance or official permission for field sampling is not mentioned and should be clearly stated. The manuscript needs improvement in grammar and sentence construction to enhance readability. While the discussion includes comparisons with previous studies, it could be more focused and analytical rather than descriptive. The absence of a clearly defined limitations section is also noted. Overall, the study is meaningful and contributes useful data, but requires revision for clarity, consistency, and better presentation.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT