

Manuscript: “**Effet De Quelques Propriétés Du Sol Sur L’occurrence Et L’abondance De Lippia Multiflora M. (Verbenaceae) Dans Le Système Savanicolé De Tiébissou, Au Centre De La Côte d’Ivoire”**

Submitted: 05 November 2020

Accepted: 01 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Yao Saraka Didier Martial

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p158

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pitou Woklin Euloge Kone,
Université Nangui Abrogoua / Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Pitou Woklin Euloge KONE	Email:
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua / Côte d’Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Effet de quelques propriétés du sol sur l’occurrence et l’abondance de <i>Lippia</i>	

<i>multiflora</i> M. (Verbenaceae) dans le système savanicole de Tiebissou, au Centre de la Côte d'Ivoire
ESJ Manuscript Number: 11126/20
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>Yes</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Yes, grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are few in this text</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, study methods are clearly explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The Results are clear but contain some errors in the report on text</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, conclusion or summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4

References needs to be put in order

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):

Authors should integrate minor revision indicated on the document and should take attention when describing in the text results presented in tables.