

Manuscript: “**Inventaire Et Identification Des Plantes Melliferes De La Zone Guineenne : Cas De La Foret Yapi Daniel Et Extension (Sud De La Cote D’ivoire)**”

Submitted: 28 August 2020

Accepted: 17 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Assi Kaudjhis Chimène

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p315](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p315)

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Kouao Jean Koffi

**Reviewer 2:** Emma Aké Assi

# ***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: KOFFI Kouao Jean	
University/Country: University Nangui Abrogoua / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: November 02, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: November 03, 2020
Manuscript Title: Inventaire et identification des plantes mellifères de la zone guinéenne : cas de la forêt Yapi Daniel et extension (sud-est de la Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0937/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

The summary should set the context of the study	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

We have made our comments in the text and the authors must take this into account.

# ***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: Aké-Assi Emma épouse Kouassi	Email:
University/Country: Université Félix-Houphouët Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 04 Novembre 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 11 Novembre 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Inventaire et identification des plantes mellifères de la zone guinéenne : cas de la forêt Yapi Daniel et extension (Sud-Est de la Côte d'Ivoire)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>3709/20</b>	
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: <u>Yes</u>	

## **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>Le titre est explicite cependant, dans la forme il doit être centré ainsi que le nom des auteurs et les différentes structures doivent indiqués en dessous de chaque auteur.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>Dans l'ensemble l'article se lit facilement cependant les phrases sont parfois longues avec quelques rares fautes d'orthographe</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il est nécessaire de définir le "degré de domestication" dans la méthodologie</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<i>Les auteurs citées dans l'ensemble du texte sont mentionnés dans les références bibliographiques, à par quelques fautes d'écritures et de mise en forme observées.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, 09. needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Nous proposons aux auteurs de bien vouloir prendre en compte nos suggestions pour améliorer la qualité de leur travail.