

Paper: “Diversité Floristique des Forêts Dégradées de l’Unité Forestière d’Exploitation (UFE) Nyanga, Située au Sud-Ouest de la République du Congo”

Submitted: 22 August 2023

Accepted: 29 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Koubouana Félix

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p281](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p281)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sanogo Souleymane
Université Nazi BONI, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Tounsi K. Gilles
Université de Yaoundé I - Ngoa-Ekellé, Cameroun

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Souleymane SANOGO	
University/Country: Université Nazi BONI / Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/08/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/09/2023
Manuscript Title: Diversité floristique des forêts dégradées de l'Unité Forestière d'Exploitation Nyanga, située au sud-ouest de la République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: O911/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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>(the title reflects the content of the article, but there is a difference between English and French)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(The objective is not well defined)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(It would be necessary to proofread thoroughly to correct certain errors.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(These are standard methods, so they have been well formulated)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results are clear, but the authors need to revise the graphs, especially the histograms, which are not scaled appropriately. I pointed out some of them in the document)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Good conclusion)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(This part has not been well done. It needs to be reworked)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors need to review the way in which the results are presented.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: