
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 team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Socio-anthropological factors as sources of desecration of Grébouo 1 sacred grove (Southwestern Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 126.09.2018	

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.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title could be delimited (delimited) depending on the objectives of the study.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i> The summary does present objectives, method and results. I suggest showing them explicitly.	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> I did not find grammar or spelling errors. I did find the need for indentations in the first line in each paragraph, as well as to correct some citations and conjunctions (they are indicated in the text) and to indicate the titles of second level in the methodology.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<p><i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>The study methods are not clearly explained.</p> <p>I suggest structuring and completing the methodology section: clearly indicate the type of study (mixed), the design of the study and the temporal delimitation (spatial delimitation is widely described). As well as the type of qualitative sampling, the selection of the participants, the data collection techniques, the selection criteria (inclusion, exclusion and elimination), the data analysis plan, the methodological procedure and the ethical considerations of the study. : where it was registered and the registration number.</p> <p>The authors of the discussion are not mentioned previously in the introduction. It is necessary to show the context of the previous studies from the beginning to give rise to the subsequent discussion.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<p><i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>In general, the body of the article is clear and contains no errors, I slavbo what I have indicated in this format and in the manuscript.</p> <p>I emphasize that the figures and tables are not placed after the text where they are mentioned.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<p><i>(An explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>The conclusions do not correspond completely with the results obtained.</p> <p>I suggest more systematization between the objectives, results and conclusions to find an exact correspondence.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	1
<p><i>(All the sources in the list of references are cited in the content and vice versa)</i></p>	
<p><i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i></p> <p>The references are complete but they are not voiced according to APA.</p>	

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):

It is a very interesting study. I congratulate the authors for carrying it out. However, the document needs more systematization to highlight the important study carried out.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

