

Manuscript: “**Étude Ethnobotanique Des Plantes Utilisées Dans L’artisanat Chez Les Agni Du Centre-Est Et Nord-Est De La Côte d’Ivoire**”

Submitted: 18 December 2020

Accepted: 27 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Dr. Amani Leopold Litta

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p133

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ta Bi Irié Honoré,
Université de Man, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Diomandé Souleymane
Université Jean LorougnonGuédé, Côte d’Ivoire

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: Ta Bi IriéHonoré	Email:
University/Country: Université de Man, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 31-10-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03-11-2020
Manuscript Title: Étude ethnobotanique des plantes utilisées dans l'artisanat, et comparaison du savoir traditionnel : cas des communautés Agni du Centre-est et Nord-est de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1149/20	
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.	3
<i>Le titre est un peu lourd pour le contenu. La comparaison du savoir traditionnel n'est pas suffisamment établie. Nous avons fait une proposition de titre.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>Le résumé est bon.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Bonne rédaction</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La méthode de travail est clairement exposée mais ce n'est pas le cas pour le matériel utilisé.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Bons résultats</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Bonne conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont bien présentées et bien actualisées.</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):

Le manuscrit a un bon contenu avec beaucoup de traitements statistiques des données. Cependant, nous recommandons aux auteurs de consulter les archives du journal ESJ pour se conformer aux normes de présentation. Dans le texte, le passage d'une partie à une autre doit être espacé. En rapport avec le titre de l'article, la comparaison du savoir traditionnel n'est pas suffisamment traitée dans cette étude. Nous proposons un autre titre : Étude ethnobotanique des plantes utilisées dans l'artisanat chez les Agni du Centre-est et Nord-est de la Côte d'Ivoire.

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: Diomandé Souleymane	Email:
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/11/2020
Manuscript Title: Étude ethnobotanique des plantes utilisées dans l'artisanat et comparaison du savoir traditionnel : cas des communautés Agni du Centre-est et Nord-est de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1149/20	
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.	4,5
yes	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
yes	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>yes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are comprehensive but it is not appropriate according authors guide line</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):

It would be important that you take into account the editorial guide when developing the bibliographic reference