

Paper: “Caractérisation des Facteurs de Menace sur la Population Sauvage de Mones de Lowe Cercopithecus lowei Thomas, 1923 dans la Relique Forestière de l’Université NANGUI ABROGOUA, Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 06 June 2022

Accepted: 27 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Sammidjo Kambire

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p319](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p319)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adéréwa Amontcha
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Adéréwa AMONTCHA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 / 06 / 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23 / 06 / 2022
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation des facteurs de menace sur une population sauvage de Mones de Lowe <i>Cercopithecus lowei</i> Thomas, 1923 dans la relique forestière l'Université NANGUI ABROGOUA, Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25.06.2022.	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques fautes de grammaire et de conjugaison ont été soulignées dans le document	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le lien n'a pas été fait entre les caractéristiques du milieu qui ont été présentées, et l'objet de l'étude Une erreur a été soulignée dans la clarification des paramètres qui ont servi à déterminer la taille de l'échantillon.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques défauts de sens ont été soulignés dans la formulation des résultats présentés	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a quelques reformulation à y faire	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: