

Manuscript: “**Rol Ecológico Del Zorro Pampeano (Lycalopex Gymnocercus) Como Dispersor De Semillas En Ambientes De Agroecosistema Y Bosques Serranos De Argentina**”

**Submitted: 05 October 2020**

**Accepted: 01 December 2020**

**Published: 31 December 2020**

Corresponding Author: Claudia M. Dellafiore

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p223

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Francisco Gonzalez Garcia,  
University of Granada, Spain

**Reviewer 2:** Valeria Santa,  
Universidad Nacional, Argentina

**Reviewer 3:** Kengne Olivier Clovis,  
University of Maroua, Cameroon

## ***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!***

---

Date Manuscript Received: 5 octubre 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 8 octubre 2020
Manuscript Title: ROL ECOLÓGICO DEL ZORRO PAMPEANO (LYCALOPEX GYMNOERCUS) COMO DISPERSOR DE SEMILLAS EN AMBIENTES DE AGROECOSISTEMA Y BOSQUES SERRANOS DE ARGENTINA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 80.10.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) En el título el nombre de la especie no debería parecer en mayúsculas, sino del siguiente modo: Lycalopex gymnocercus</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>El texto se lee con facilidad, más allá de algunos términos del castellano que son propios del país iberoamericano de los autores. Corregir el vocablo Introduction, es Introducción</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Se deben incluir los meses en que se tomaron las muestras. Se indica que son 15 (entendiendo que es un año y tres meses, pero no está claro). El procedimiento para clasificar las especies vegetales, a partir de sus semillas; es decir la identificación de las semillas se describe sin ninguna referencia a trabajos previos o a metodología de identificación. Esta parte del material es poco aclaratoria, debería mejorarse sustancialmente.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
Se sugierer hacer algún comentario sobre los cambios en las semillas encontradas a lo largo del año. O indicar que se va a estudiar mas adelante.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Se debe revisar en profundidad las referencias. He encontrado varios errores. Por ejemplo:</i> <i>Cabrera aparece citado con dos años diferentes. Lucherini tambie aparece con errores.</i> <i>Jayat (1999) y Janzen (1991) no aparece en las referencias y si citados en el texto.</i>	

**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):**

Revisar referencias y capitulo de metodos, según lo indicado.

## ***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: Valeria Santa	Email:
------------------------------	--------

University/Country: Universidad Nacional - Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 11-11-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 13-11-2020
Manuscript Title: ROL ECOLÓGICO DEL ZORRO PAMPEANO ( <i>LYCALOPEX GYMNOCERCUS</i> ) COMO DISPERSOR DE SEMILLAS EN AMBIENTES DE AGROECOSISTEMA Y BOSQUES SERRANOS DE ARGENTINA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 80.10.2020	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>En el texto algunos nombres de familias aparecen con mayúsculas y otros con minúsculas, sugiero unificarlos.</p> <p>Todos los subtítulos dentro del texto están en español, sugiero cambiar “REFERENCES” a español también.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>Hay algunas citas bibliográficas mal escritas. Por ejemplo: Tchaicka L., Freitas T. R., Bager A., Vidal S.L., Lucherini, M. <b>et al.;</b> (2016)</p> <p>Hay bibliografía en el texto que no está citada en referencias, como por ejemplo: Bellati &amp; von Thüngen 1990.</p>	

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

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

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

## ***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: KENGNE Olivier Clovis	
--------------------------------------	--

University/Country: University of Maroua (Cameroon)	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/11/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Les forêts sacrées dans les Hautes Terres de l'Ouest-Cameroun : intérêt dans la conservation de la biodiversité</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1080/20	
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>	
Revoir le titre (reformuler) « Les forêts sacrées des Hautes-Terres de l'Ouest Cameroun : intérêt pour la conservation de la biodiversité »	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	
L'objectif de l'étude n'est pas clairement présenté dans le résumé puisqu'il ne concorde pas avec le titre. Cet objectif differe de celui donné dans la partie Introduction. Les indices de diversité ici doivent être ceux des différentes forêts sacrées étudiées et non des parcelles. Le résumé diffère de l'abstract puisque dans l'abstract les sites et les zones d'études sont absents.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
L'article contient trop de fautes d'orthographe, de conjugaison et des erreurs grammaticales (les accords ne sont pas toujours respectés). Les phrases sont assez mal construites. Trop de point-virgules à l'intérieur des phrases rendent le style lourd et le texte incompréhensible.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
Il faut faire la presentation des différentes zones et des sites d'étude. Les noms sont illisibles sur la fig.1	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
Les résultats sont à revoir pour ce qui est du calcul de la richesse spécifique et des indices de diversité par type de forêt. Les moyennes et les écart-types ne sont pas appropriés dans ce cas sauf pour le calcul des densité et des surfaces terrières. Il	

manque dans ces résultats le calcul des densités des arbustes ou des arbres. Il faut une interprétation claire de la fig.2, donner aux espèces les statuts de conservation récents. Les auteurs doivent ressortir les groupements végétaux en les nommant en fonction des espèces clé ou dominantes. Faire des tests statistiques pour comparer les paramètres structuraux (densité et surface terrière).	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
La conclusion ne montre pas les intérêts que les forêts sacrées apportent dans la conservation de la biodiversité de chaque zone étudiée. Il faut présenter les spécificités pour chaque forêt sacrée dans la conservation de la biodiversité en fonction des activités humaines dans les zones étudiées.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
Les références sont appropriées pour cette étude mais les citations sont mal faites (voir la méthode de citation des articles et autres ouvrages prescrite par la revue ESJ)	

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

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

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

Cette étude qui a été menée sur les forêts sacrées de l'Ouest Cameroun ne présente pas une problématique claire et acceptable. Des confusions subsistent dans l'analyse statistique des données. L'étude serait plus crédible si les auteurs prennent en compte l'importance de la biodiversité dans les forêts sacrées étudiées et l'utilité des forêts sacrées dans la conservation des espèces. Il manque également les résultats sur les différents rôles sacrés joués par chaque espèce végétale. Cette étude pourra être acceptée si les auteurs revoient les suggestions et les recommandations faites dans le document principal.