

Manuscript: “**Needles in Talassemtane National Park, North-Western Rif Region, Morocco**”

Peer review:

Submitted: 29 September 2020

Accepted: 13 October 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Hajar Lamrhari

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p189

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Miguel Alberto Magaña Alejandro  
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco/México

**Reviewer 2:** Edson Kemoi  
University of Kabianga, Kenya

**Reviewer 3:** Cinaría Albadri, Iraq

# ***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. Miguel Alberto Magaña Alejandro	
University/Country: Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco/ México	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Morphological And Anatomical Characteristics Of Moroccan Fir Needles In Talassemstane National Park, North-Western Rif, Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1041/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
Present a clear title consistent with the content of the document	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
The summary is very clear and easy to understand	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The document has few grammatical errors	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes, the methodology is very clear and understandable when describing the way the research was carried out	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The article is very clear and the amount of spelling errors is minimal	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The summary is very clear as well as the conclusion of which the information is supported in the document	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Some references that are not cited in the text are missing, and many of them are very old.	

**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):**

The study is very interesting, however, they considered that they should use more recent information and check that all the bibliography that they note in the references is cited in the text.

# ***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: Cinaria Albadri	
University/Country: Trinity College Dublin University, Ireland	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/10/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Morphological And Anatomical Characteristics Of Moroccan Fir Needles In Talassemrane National Park, North-Western Rif, Morocco</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 41.10.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is clear with appropriate structure and adequate to the content of the article. The language used is easy and understandable. As the sample size was taken within the Rif mountain region, it is only suggested to add “Region” to the title to become: “Morphological and anatomical characteristics of Moroccan fir needles in Talassemrane National Park, North-Western Rif Region, Morocco.”	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract summarizes most of the study, and clearly presents the objects, methods and key findings with an appropriate length (214 words). The abstract lacks the structure of the subheadings (Purpose, Methods, Results and Conclusion) according to the journal guidelines.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The paper is clear and well organized. Few grammatical errors that require revise by the author/s. <b>Ex.:</b> temperature is around of 12-14 °c, where temperature in centigrade ‘°C’, this needs to be revised.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
Description of methods is well described according to the research’s nature, purpose and design. Random sampling was effectively employed in data gathering and resulted in clear fulfilment of the research aims. The sampling size and time of research conducting were clearly specified.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
The paper is clear and well accordant with the scope of the journal. It puts into perspective what is subsequent, with plausible size for each part. The purpose of the study is clear. The results were explained in sequential order and the data presented in tables and figures. The discussion clearly summarized the results of the study and indicated similar previous studies to support the findings. Correction of Figure 6 to ‘Figure 5’	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content. It contains the key findings of the study. However, here the author/s need to correct the grammar errors (line 5) in this part of the Conclusion.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
It is recommended to use up-to-date references	

**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):**

Title: The word “Region” should be added to the title: “Morphological and anatomical characteristics of Moroccan fir needles in Talassemrane National Park, North-Western Rif Region, Morocco.”

Limitations: Include limitations for this study, if any.

Literature: It is preferable to use up to date references.

Results: Correction of Figure 6 to ‘Figure 5’

Conclusion: Correct the grammar error in line 5

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

/////