
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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: Alla Manga	Email:
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 08/10/2018
Manuscript Title: DYNAMIQUE DE LA MANGROVE DE THIOBON DANS L'ESTUAIRE DE LA CASAMANCE (SENEGAL) ENTRE 1972 ET 2017	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name to be revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	

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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'étude s'est faite dans la fourchette de temps indiquée et porte sur l'évolution e la mangrove Dans le terroir de Thibon en basse-Casamance.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé est bien clair.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Les remarques ont été prises en compte.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Je reviens encore une fois pour préciser qu'il y a des erreurs liées aux superficies des périodes considérées dans le corps du texte. En effet, en comparant les superficies des tableaux 3 (11004,6 ha), 4 (9592,9 ha) et 5 (9808,7 ha), je note qu'i y a une variation. En principe, la fenêtre ou la zone étudiée étant la même pour les 03 périodes, nous devrions avoir une superficie totale unique, ce n'est qu'à l'intérieur des classes que nous aurions dû avoir des variations.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

(Please summarize your opinion and suggestions)

Revoir la conformité des superficies des tableaux 3, 4 et 5.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Je vous prie de veiller à ce que les superficies de la zone étudiée soient uniques pour les tableaux 3, 4 et 5.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

