



Paper: “Grasses (Poaceae) From Senegal: New Records Checklist, Biogeographical Affinities and Biological Types“

Corresponding Author:

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p177

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Baba-Moussa Lamine, University of Abomey-Calavi

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Ranjana Negi, Forest research Institute, Dehradun-248006, India

Reviewer 4: Olu-Ajayi Funmilayo Elizabeth, Ekiti State University, Nigeria

Published: 30.06.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Grasses (Poaceae) from Senegal: new records checklist, biogeographical affinities and biological types	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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
Grasses (<i>Poaceae</i>) from Senegal: new records checklist, biogeographical affinities and biological types	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

The abstract clearly presents objects but does not present the methods and the results as well. Apart from the research made from local sources; no other means of research used this document has been presented in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
No comment	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
No comment	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Please consider revising the conclusion. It needs minor correction.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
No comment	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Consider revising the abstract.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: