



Paper: “Inventaire Et Diversité Des Essences Commerciales Dans Deux Forêts Périurbaines De Brazzaville : Le Site Continental De La Djoumouna Et Le Site Insulaire Loufézou (République Du Congo)”

Corresponding Author: Edmond Sylvestre Miabangana

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p217](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p217)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Benderradji Laid

Published: 30.09.2020

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/08/20
Manuscript Title: INVENTAIRE ET DIVERSITÉ DES ESSENCES COMMERCIALES DANS DEUX FORÊTS PÉRIURBAINES DE BRAZZAVILLE : LE SITE CONTINENTAL DE LA DJOUMOUNA ET LE SITE INSULAIRE LOUFÉZOU (RÉPUBLIQUE DU CONGO)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0881/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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.	3
<i>Supprimer le terme “Diversité” dans le titre</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>La méthodologie n’est pas clairement présentée</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le texte contient quelques fautes d'orthographe</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p>Méthodes de collecte et de traitement des données</p> <p>Deux périodes de collecte de données sont mentionnées mais sans expliquer le pourquoi, alors que le laps de temps les séparant est grand. Pour la première période, il est dit qu'elle débute en 1998 mais il n'est dit quand elle s'est achevée.</p> <p>Vous mentionnez que "Tous les arbres et les arbustes réalisant une circonférence à hauteur de poitrine, $CHP \geq 31,4$ cm ont été concernés". Mais après, vous dites encore que "Les individus hors relevé, ont été également soumis à des mensurations". Est ce à dire que tous les arbres ont été contrôlés?</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Revoir l'utilisation du terme "sus-cité" . il n'est pas tout temps approprié</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Pas besoin de revenir sur la méthodologie utilisée.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références sont complètes et appropriées</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Expliquer l'abréviation "Dbh"

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: BENDERRADJI Laid	
University/Country: University of M'sila /Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/09/2020
Manuscript Title: INVENTORY AND DIVERSITY OF TIMBER SPECIES IN TWO PERI-URBAN BRAZZAVILLE FORESTS: THE DJOUMOUNA CONTINENTAL SITE AND THE LOUFÉZOU ISLAND SITE (REPUBLIC OF CONGO)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0881/20	
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.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments): Yes, it's very clear</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments) :Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4/5
<i>(Please insert your comments) : In general, there is no mistakes in the language of this paper and also no grammatical error found</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments): Yes</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments): Yes</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments): Conclusions summarize all results and it's accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments): Yes</i>	
Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)	
Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Well prepared paper

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper is well prepared, with interesting results, so I agree that will be published.