
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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 report. 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. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. 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 teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 05/03/2018
Manuscript Title: Systemes Agroforestiers à <i>Garcinia kola</i> Heckel au Sud-Est du Bénin : Distribution Géographique, Connaissances Endogènes et Retombées Financières	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an 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. (a brief explanation is recommendable) All elements mentioned in the title were presented in the article.	4
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. (An explanationis recommendable) All parts (subject, objectives, methods and results) are clearly recognizable in the abstract.	5
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (a brief explanation is recommendable) The article is globally well writing, even if it is remaining a few errors and mistakes to correct.	1
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
A big effort was done to explain the study methods, but some details still need. For example: how interviewees estimated tree's age and their benefits; why there was disparity between number of interviewees in different communes (30, 46 and 64).	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i>	
The body of the paper is clear but, some parts have to be reviewed. Indeed, in introduction, the study was not well justified, regarding of bibliography. Some results, especially the PCA's and ethnobotanical ones, were not discussed. In the light of yours results, you have to talk about implications for conservation strategies.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(An explanationis recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i>	
<i>(abrief explanationis recommendable)</i>	
<p>The following references were cited but not listed:</p> <p>Farombi <i>et al.</i>, 2000) Adjanonhoun <i>et al.</i> (1989), Kouchadé (2013) Byg et Baslev (2001), Gomez-Beloz (2002) ; de Freitas <i>et al.</i> (2010) ;</p> <p>The following references are in the list but not cited:</p> <p>6. Anegbeh P. O., Ladipo D. O. & Tchoundjeu Z. (2005). Using marcotting technique for fruit dev in the African Pear, <i>Dacryodes edulis</i>. <i>Scientia Africana</i> 4 (1&2): 102-108</p> <p>12. Farombi E.O., Alabi M. C. & Akuru T. O. (2002). Kolaviron modulates cellular redox status and impairment of membrane protein activities induced by potassium bromate (KBrO3) in rats. <i>Pharmacol. Res.</i> 45(1): 63-68.</p> <p>13. Farombi E. O., Adepoju B. F., Ola-Davies O. E. & Emerole G. O., (2005). Chemoprevention of aflatoxin B1-induced genotoxicity and hepatic oxidative damage in rats by kolaviron, a natural bioflavonoid of <i>Garcinia kola</i> seeds. <i>Eur J Cancer Prev.</i> 14(3): 207-214.</p> <p>19. Mac Arthur R. H. & Wilson E. O. (1967). <i>The theory of Island Biogeography</i>. Princeton University press New Jersey. 224 p.</p> <p>“Neuenschwander <i>et al.</i> 2014” was cited, but it was “21. Neuenschwander P., Sinsin B. & Goergen G.(eds). (2011). <i>Protection de la Nature en Afrique de l’Ouest: une liste rouge pour le Bénin</i>. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria. 365 p.” in the list.</p> <p>“Tchoundjeu <i>et al.</i> 2006 ” was cited, but it was “Tchoundjeu Z., Duguma B., Tiencheu M. L. & Ngo-Mpeck M. L. (1996). <i>La domestication des arbres indigènes agroforestiers: la stratégie du CIRAF dans les régions tropicales humides d’Afrique Centrale et d’Afrique de l’Ouest</i>. FAO.” in the list.</p>	

In general, references are not recent. The last ones are published in 2011.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Most of my comments and suggestions are reported in the manuscript.

References have to be up dated in order to improve the introduction and the discussion. The objectives have to be well justified.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study is interesting because of the species *Garcinia kola* that is poorly documented. Methodology used is not innovative but before publication, the manuscript has to be really corrected. I do not if corrections can be described as minor or not.

