

Manuscript: “**Les Forêts Sacrées Dans Les Hautes Terres De l’Ouest-Cameroun : Intérêt Dans La Conservation De La Biodiversité**”

Submitted: 29 October 2020

Accepted: 07 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Bertine Tiokeng

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p234

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. Toleba,
Universite d’Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

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. Ir. Mamam S. TOLEBA	
University/Country: Université d’Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 01.12.20	Date Review Report Submitted: 04.12.20
Manuscript Title: Les forêts sacrées dans les Hautes Terres de l’Ouest-Cameroun : intérêt dans la conservation de la biodiversité	

ESJ Manuscript Number: 80.11.2020
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> 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.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Titre de l'article acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Résumé acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Texte du document acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Texte du document acceptable, mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Résultats acceptables mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Conclusion acceptable mais peut mieux faire.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Références bibliographies acceptables, mais peut mieux faire.</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):

Les Auteurs ont fait un grand effort de correction du document de base. Toutes mes félicitations pour les efforts fournis. Bon courage !!!

Le grand souhait de l'Examineur est que les points d'attention notés soient un acquis à capitaliser pour les prochains articles.