

Paper: “Savoir Traditionnel et Conservation de la Biodiversité dans le Rift Albertin: cas des Peuples Pygmée et Lega Riverains de la Réserve Naturelle d’Itombwe à l’Est de la RD Congo”

Submitted: 14 June 2021

Accepted: 09 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Jean de Dieu Mangambu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n32p319

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Toure Krouele
Ecole Normale Supérieure d’Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 2: Kaka Kiari Boukar K.
Université de Niamey et de Diffa, Niger

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: Boukar Kéllou KAKA KIARI	
University/Country: Université de Niamey et de Diffa	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Savoir traditionnel et conservation de la biodiversité dans le Rift Albertin: cas des peuples Pygmée et Lega riverains de la Réserve Naturelle d'Itombwe à l'Est de la RD Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0671/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Veillez améliorer votre résumé!</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Veillez intégrer mes observations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: août 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 30 août 2021.
Manuscript Title: Savoir traditionnel et conservation de la biodiversité dans le Rift Albertin: cas des peuples Pygmée et Lega riverains de la Réserve Naturelle d'Itombwe à l'Est de la RD Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 71.06.2021	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le titre peut évoluer pour s'adapter au contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir le texte du résumé	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le texte doit être relu attentivement. Construire des phrases simples traduisant une seule idée à la fois.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il semble préférable d'appliquer la méthode IMRAD.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La forme du texte peut être améliorée.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats doivent permettre de tester les variables manipulées.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir la présentation des références.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le thème de l'article est très intéressant car il porte sur la préservation de la biodiversité. L'humanité est à la recherche des moyens pour une vie durable sur la planète. Le texte peut être publié s'il prend en compte les observations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

L'article porte sur un thème d'actualité. Il peut être publié s'il prend en compte les observations.