

Manuscript: “**Distribution De Amanita Subviscosa Beeli, Une Espèce Ectomycorhizienne Mal Connue Dans Le Parc National Du W Du Niger (Afrique De l’Ouest)**”

Submitted: 09 September 2020

Accepted: 30 September 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding author: Oumarou Hama

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n30p172

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelfettah Maouni
Abdelmalek Essaadi University-Tetouan -Morocco

Reviewer 2: Denis Gnanguenon Guesse
Université De Abomey-Calavi (UAC) Benin

Reviewer 3: Dr Sanon Elise
Burkina Faso

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: Abdelfettah MAOUNI	Email:
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University-Tetouan -Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 /09/ 2020 17:07	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/09/2020 19h
Manuscript Title: Distribution de <i>Amanita subviscosa</i> Beeli, une espèce ectomycorhizienne comestible mais mal connue dans le Parc National du W du Niger (Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09101/20	
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 published version 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
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	X

Rejection reasons:

1. **Old work research and collection: 2008-2012**
2. **Cartography not well worked, not well target**
3. **Classical macroscopic and microscopic study**
4. **Identification not perfectly founded**
5. **No parfait description of *Amanita subviscosa***
6. **Objective not achieved** « *Cet article a pour objectif principal de décrire Amanita subviscosa, en tant qu'espèce ectomycorhizienne comestible, mal connue, mais présente dans les différents biotopes du Parc National du W du Niger* ».

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Evaluation du Manuscip

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: Gnangenon-Guesseè Denis	Email:
University/Country: Université de Abomey-Calavi (UAC) BENIN	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Distribution de <i>Amanitasubviscosa</i> Beeli, une espèce ectomycorhizienne comestible mais mal connue dans le Parc National du W du Niger (Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 101.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Oui	

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
Le titre est clair et adapté au contenu de l'article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

Le résumé présente très bien les objectifs (général et spécifique) avec une méthodologie claire et très compréhensible. Les résultats sont bien décrits.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Il n'y a pas trop d'erreurs grammaticales et d'orthographe dans cet article. Il y a lieu de vérifier l'écriture de certains mots et d'autres auteurs cités dans le texte	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Les méthodes d'étude sont bien expliquées et bien compréhensibles	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
Le corps du document est clair et bien lisible. Il ne contient pas d'erreur	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Il est souhaitable de séparer les discussions de la conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Giulbert (1941), Belli (1935); Hama <i>et al.</i> , 2019 n'existent pas dans le document dans la bibliographie. Bien vouloir vérifier et harmoniser leurs écritures dans la bibliographie et le texte.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, minor revision needed	4,5
---------------------------------	------------

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- a) Bien vouloir aligner les travaux de HAMA O de façon chronologique comme l'a fait pour Sanon .
- b) Bien vouloir différencier dans le texte et dans la Bibliographie les travaux de 2002 de Yorou et *al.* de 2002 par les lettres a et b comme chez Hama.
- c) Bien vouloir aligner les travaux de HEINEMANN P. & RAMMELOO J de façon chronologique comme l'a fait pour Sanon
- d) Giulbert (1941), Belli (1935); Hama *et al.*, 2019 n'existent pas dans le document dans la bibliographie. Bien vouloir vérifier et harmoniser leurs écritures dans la bibliographie et le texte.

Conclusion: Cet article valorise la biodiversité du Parc National du W du Niger en particulier et du Parc National W de l'Afrique de l'Ouest en général. Il mérite d'être amélioré et publié.