

Manuscript: “**Impacts D’une Technique De Restauration De Terre Dégradée Sur La Survie Et La Croissance Des Plants De Quatre Espèces De Combretaceae En Zone Sahélienne Du Niger**”

**Submitted: 17 September 2021**

**Accepted: 07 December 2021**

**Published: 31 December 2021**

Corresponding Author: Amani Abdou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n43p134

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** MOUSSA Loukmane, Université d’Abomey-Calavi

**Reviewer 2:** Gnamien Konan Bah Modeste, Université Jean Lorougnon Guede – Daloa Cote D’ivoire

**Reviewer 3:** Mahamane Larwanou, Université Abdou Moumouni, Niger

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: MOUSSA Loukmane	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Impacts d'une technique de restauration de terre dégradée sur la survie et la croissance des plants de Quatre espèces de combretaceae en zone sahélienne	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 07.10.2021	
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>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

RAS

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: GNAMIEN KONAN BAH MODESTE	Email:
University/Country: UNIVERSITE JEAN LOROUGNON GUEDE – DALOA COTE D’IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/11/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/12/2020
Manuscript Title : <b>Impacts d’une technique de restauration de terre dégradée sur la survie et la croissance des plants de quatre espèces de Combretaceae en zone sahélienne du Niger</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number : Paper for review 1007/21	
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 published version 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>	<b>4</b>
Le titre est clair et reflète le contenu.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>results.</b>	
RAS	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Les erreurs gramaticales sont moindres.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
La méthodologie est claire et bien expliquée. Mais le choix du site est à justifier.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
RAS	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
La conclusion et le résumé reprennent fidèlement le contenu.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
Les références sont compréhensives et appropriées	

**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):**

J'encourage auteurs à prendre en compte toutes les suggestions.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Merci pour la confiance renouvelée.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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: Mahamane Larwanou	
University/Country: Université Abdou Moumouni, Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/12/2021
Manuscript Title: <b>Impacts D'une Technique De Restauration de Terre Dégradée Sur La Survie Et La Croissance Des Plants De Quatre Espèces De Combretaceae En Zone Sahélienne</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No: 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>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments) The title of the manuscript is very clear and understandable</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments): the abstract should have been more clearer if the methodology is well stated</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments): this paper is well written and clearly understandable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Very good methodology</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments). I loved the way the results and discussions are presented.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments);: More efforts should have been done in terms of up to date references.</i>	

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

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

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

This is a very good paper that brings a plus in understanding the behaviour of these 4 local species. I really enjoyed reading this paper.

