



Paper: **“Diversité Floristique Des Lianes De La Forêt Classée De Bouaflé, Centre-Ouest De La Côte D’ivoire”**

Corresponding Author: Koffi Desire N'goran

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p17

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edmond Sylvestre Miabangana Herbar National Du Congo (IEC), Institut De Recherche En Sciences Exactes Et Naturelles, Cité De La Science, Brazzaville, République Du Congo

Reviewer 2: Dr Doudjo Noufou Ouattara, Université Nangui Abrogoua/Côte D’ivoire

Reviewer 3: Yao Konan Université Félix Houphouet-Boigny (Côte d’Ivoire)

Reviewer 4: Awa Diomande UNA/ Côte d’Ivoire

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Edmond Sylvestre MIABANGANA	
University/Country: Herbier National du Congo (IEC), Institut de Recherche en Sciences Exactes et Naturelles, Cité de la Science, Brazzaville, République du Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Diversité floristique des lianes de la forêt classée de Bouaflé, Centre-Ouest de la Côte d’Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0804/20	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La deuxième phrase du résumé doit être complétée ! “ La diversité de ces plantes dans quatre Types d’Occupation du Sol (TOS) de la forêt classée de Bouaflé a été étudiée (abordée). Il en est de même de l’abréviation de TOS qui doit être définie.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Taxonomie : Les noms pilotes des essences doivent être transcrits scientifiquement au moins une fois dans le texte (Teck : <u><i>Tectona grandis</i> L. f.</u> (Verbenaceae) ; Fraké : <u><i>Terminalia superba</i> Engl. & Diels</u> & Framiré : <u><i>Terminalia ivorensis</i> A. Chev.</u> (Tous deux relevant de la famille des Combretaceae), enfin Hévéa : <u><i>Hevea brasiliensis</i> (A. Juss.) Müll. Arg.</u> (Euphorbiaceae). <u><i>Nauclea latifolia</i> Sm</u> (Rubiaceae) n’est pas une espèce lianescente. Parler uniquement des lianes prélevées dans l’introduction, comme service écosystémique. Toujours reprendre les noms des parrains dans la combinaison spécifique, à moins d’être signalé en annexe (Recommandation du Code International de Nomenclature Botanique). Idem pour : <u><i>Abrus precatorius</i> L.</u> (Fabaceae) <u><i>Adenia lobata</i> (Jacq.) Engl.</u> (Passifloraceae) <u><i>Combretum zenkeri</i> Engl. & Diels</u> (Combretaceae) <u><i>Acacia pennata</i> auct.</u> (Voir : <u><i>Acacia kamerunensis</i> Gand.</u> , Mimosaceae) Lire : <u><i>Salacia owabiensis</i> Hoyle</u> , Celastraceae) au lieu de <u><i>Salacia owariensis</i></u> Lire : <u><i>Cryptolepis calophylla</i> (Baill.) L. Joubert & Bruyns</u> (Apocynaceae), au lieu de <u><i>Parquetina nigrescens</i> (Afzel.) Bullock</u> <u><i>Icacina mannii</i> Oliv.</u> (Icacinaceae) <u><i>Griffonia simplicifolia</i> (Vahl ex DC.) Baill.</u> (Caesalipiniaceae) <u><i>Rutidea smithii</i> Hiern</u> (Rubiaceae) <u><i>Passiflora foetida</i> L.</u> (Passifloraceae) <u><i>Adenia cissampeloides</i> (Planch. ex Hook.) Harms</u> (Passifloraceae) <u><i>Phyllanthus muellerianus</i> (Kuntze) Exell</u> (Phyllanthaceae)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Page 6 : Les flores de Côte d’Ivoire et d’Afrique (Lebrun et Stork, 1991 ; 1992) et la flore de l’Afrique de l’Ouest de Bongers et <i>al.</i> (2005)... Lebrun et Stork, 1991 ; 1992 : n’est pas une flore, mais un référentiel taxonomique mis régulièrement à jour et disponible sur la toile. La version actuelle pour l’Afrique tropicale est : J.-P. LEBRUN & A. L. STORK (1991-2015). Enumération des plantes à fleurs d’Afrique tropicale et Tropical African Flowering Plants: Ecology and Distribution, vol. 1-7. Conservatoire et	

<p>Jardin botaniques de la Ville de Genève,</p> <p>Quel seuil de Dbh avez-vous retenu dans votre travail ? Serait-il le même que celui mentionné par Koffi et al., (2016) : $Dbh \geq 1 \text{ cm}$? Il mérite d'être précisé.</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>Le contenu est clair</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Cinq références bibliographiques sont introuvables dans le texte :</p> <p>Doucet J.L. (1996). Régénération naturelle dans la forêt des Abeilles. Gembloux, Belgique. Faculté Universitaire des sciences agronomiques (document interne), 127 p.</p> <p>Lejoly J. (1993). Méthodologie pour les inventaires forestiers (partie flore et végétation). AGRECO-CTFT, Bruxelles, Belgique, 53 p.</p> <p>Tra Bi F.H., Koné M.W. & Kouamé N.F. (2008). Antifungal activity of <i>Erigeron floribundus</i> (Asteraceae) from Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa. <i>Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</i>. 7 (2): 975-979.</p> <p>Trochain J.-L. (1980). Écologie végétale de la zone intertropicale non désertique. Publications Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, 458 p.</p> <p>Wala K. (2004). La végétation de la chaîne de l'Atakora au Bénin : diversité floristique, phytosociologie et impact humain. Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Lomé, 140 p.</p> <p>Enfin, pour une publication à deux auteurs, la référence dans le texte doit mentionner les deux. Pages (4,15 et 19) : au lieu de Koffi et al. (2016) ; écrire : Koffi et Adou Yao (2016)</p> <p><i>Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

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):

Pour la dissémination naturelle, il est mieux de parler des diaspores, plutôt que de semences (P.15).

Page 15 : La dominance des Fabaceae est un phénomène assez général dans la plupart des forêts tropicales (Tuo et *al.*, 2017). Cela est valable pour les Fabaceae pris au sens de Leguminosae (sensu APG, regroupant les anciennes familles des Caesalpiniaceae, des Fabaceae et des Mimosaceae, ramenées au rang de sous-familles dans l'approche phylogénétique). Or vous avez adopté l'approche traditionnelle (Cronquist). Vos espèces relevant de la famille des Fabaceae (Papilionaceae). Ne jamais mélanger les deux approches.

De même, Gueulou et *al.* (2018) fait mention des Fabaceae (Leguminosae, version APG), en reprenant Aubréville (1959) sur la flore forestière de la Côte d'Ivoire.

La richesse floristique mentionne 45 espèces. Dans le texte, on ne retrouve que quelques-unes. Il y a nécessité de les reprendre toutes en annexe. Les autres n'ont-elles pas été identifiées ? L'effort d'échantillonnage floristique est généralement accepté à 80 %.

Etablir les indices de connexion floristique entre les 4 types d'occupation des sols, sous forme d'un tableau à double entrée à partir du test de Sørensen. Ce qui permettrait d'apprécier la performance d'occupation des lianes dans différents TOS.

Un des paramètres de la diversité floristique est la stratification (hauteur des individus). Il y a-t-il une explication qu'on ne le retrouve pas dans les résultats, sous forme des classes y afférentes ?

Pour expliquer la régénération des lianes, il aurait fallu analyser les types de diaspores et éventuellement leur mode de dissémination de chaque espèce lianescente.

Après le tableau 1 : comparer directement la richesse taxonomique (Famille, genre, espèce) et la densité des lianes des différents TOS, sans reprendre les chiffres, déjà consignés dans le tableau. Cela est valable pour la suite.

Cette remarque ne concerne pas les figures où les proportions ne sont pas reprises.

La figure 5 de la structure diamétrique montre que les jachères et les plantations à *Terminalia* sont plus structurants en lianes. On sait que les jachères évoluent naturellement et les deux essences (*Terminalia*) sont spontanées en Côte d'Ivoire. Quant à *Tectona grandis* et *Hevea brasiliensis*, elles sont des essences introduites. Il faut exploiter cette information. En plus la sempervirescence ou la caducifoliation des essences ont un impact sur la régénération lianescente.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. ***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 Doudjo Noufou OUATTARA	Email:
University/Country: Université NANGUI ABROGOUA/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 July 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28 July 2020
Manuscript Title: DIVERSITÉ DES LIANES DE LA FORÊT CLASSÉE DE BOUAFLE, CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The word "floristique" must be removed from the title</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>In the French “résumé” you should give the definition of terms such as IVI, FIV</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No comments</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The inventory method and the analyzes are appropriate. But it will be good to give the ages of each site.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The text is easy for reading and the different parts are clearly separated</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>No comments</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>We note recent references and they treat the subject of the article</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	×
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Use APG4 as nomenclatural system

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Konan YAO	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/08/2020
Manuscript Title: DIVERSITÉ FLORISTIQUE DES LIANES DE LA FORÊT CLASSÉE DE BOUAFLE, CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0804/20	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Results

1- Regarding the result, there are some scientific names of the plant species to correct. See the manuscript.

Discussion

2- At the level of the discussion, there is a justification to be reviewed. This justification is incomplete (see manuscript). You compare two different environments (Bouaflé Classified Forest and Azagny National Park). It is not the same type of vegetation. That's what makes the difference and then come the methods used.

Conclusion

3- At the conclusion level, mature fallows remain different from primary forests (see manuscript).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article is original and very well written. Just some minor correction.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.

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: DIOMANDE AWA	
University/Country: UNA/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Diversité floristique des lianes de la forêt classée de Bouaflé, Centre-Ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the	5

article.	
The title is in keeping with the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract responds well to objective, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript present very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The study methods are explained clearly.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The discussion is not well conducted but in this part, the results obtained in this study are not indicated	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Some sources in the content are not cited from the list of references and the formatting is not uniform.	

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):

There are some mistakes in the manuscript that need to be corrected. It will be necessary to prioritize the plan, to harmonize the expressions that you used. In the discussion you should present your results before discussing them. It will also be necessary to review the entire bibliographic reference.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: