

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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: 18 jan 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 23 jan 2017
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0203/17	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>2</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>Le titre parle « Variation altitudinale et régénération de <i>Gnidia glauca</i> (Fresen) Gilg. dans les forêts communautaires de Kilum-Ijim (Nord-Ouest Cameroun) », or le manuscrit ne traite véritablement pas de la relation entre altitude et régénération, mais plutôt de la variation altitudinale de la structure et de la diversité floristique des formations à <i>Gnidia glauca</i></b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The methodology is not presented in the abstract</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The text need proofreading</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The problem statement is not clear from the introduction</b> <b>A more clear figure of the study site location need to be provided</b> <b>The results lacks ANOVA tests showing how significantly different are the floristic parameters among different altitude classes</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2,5</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <b>The authors claim in their conclusion that Gnidid could be exploited without damage on their potential. This conclusion seems not matching well with the results in view of the size class distribution of this species. Moreover, it is ecologically clear that any exploitation affect the population of a given species. the implication of this study for the conservation of this species need to be accurately presented</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	

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

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

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

The author should provide more ecological background information on the topic and the research problem should be clearly stated.

More ANOVA test need to be done to see how significantly different are the density values among altitude classes.

The management implication of this study should be considered with caution. I don't believe the structure of the population of this species supports a zero-risk exploitation as claimed by the authors.

Text need proofreading.

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

This is an interesting piece of work showing how Gnidia is distributed along an altitude gradient. The methodology used by the author is adequate.

Some improvements need to be done in the results and discussion and conclusion section

