



Paper: “Analyse De La Diversité De La Forêt Classée d’Orumbo-Boka (Centre De La Côte d’Ivoire)”

Corresponding Author: Mada Doumbia

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p184

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kouadio Yao Jean Clovis Université Félix Houphouët Boigny/Côte D’ivoire Yes

Reviewer 2: Seth Wolali Nyamador, Togo

Published: 31.08.2020

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: KOUADIO Yao Jean-Clovis | |
| University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët Boigny/Côte d'Ivoire | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 19/06/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 25/06/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Analyse de la diversité de la forêt classée d'Orumbo-boka (Centre de la Côte d'Ivoire) | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes | |

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. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>Il reste en prendre en compte les résultats portant sur le deuxième objectif</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>spécifique</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>Ne prennent pas en compte les résultats sur la caractérisation de la structure des biotopes telle que mentionnée par l'objectif spécifique 2.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Veuillez spécifier clairement le site d'étude

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Seth NYAMADOR | Email: |
| University/Country: Togo | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 29/06/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 07/07/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Analyse de la diversité de la forêt classée d’Orumbo-boka (Centre de la Côte d’Ivoire) | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 06112/20 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes | |

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. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| The title is clear and fits well with the content of the manuscript | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| Yes, the abstract of the manuscript clearly presents the objectives of the study as well as the methodology used and the main results obtained. | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are a few typos to correct in the manuscript. Our remarks are made in the text according to the "Modification tracking" mode | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methodology adopted is very clear and appropriate because it is based on well-known references in the field. | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The content of the text is clear, but there are small typos to be corrected by the authors | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion is concise and highlights the salient point of the results obtained. | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The references are appropriate and understandable. However, there are some typos to be corrected in the list of references cited (See proposal directly in the text). There are also some references cited in the text but not found in the list of bibliographical references. For example: Raunkier (1934), Pielou (1966), Adou Yao et al. (2005), Yongo (2003), Adou Yao and N'Guessan (2005), Devineau (1984), Shannon (1948), Myers (1988). In addition, other references put in the list of bibliographical references are not found at all in the text. They are: Adou Yao (2005), Aké-Assi (1984; 1988), Devineau (1984), Guillaumet (1966), Myers et al. (2003) and Shannon (1949).</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is essential that the authors of this manuscript take into account our observations to correct the text in order to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: