Manuscript: **"Connaissances Et Perceptions Des Services Écosystémiques Des Espaces Verts Des Villes De Cotonou, Abomey-Calavi Et Allada Du Sud Bénin: Implications Pour La Gestion Durable Des Forêts Urbaines Et Péri-Urbaines"**

Corresponding Author: Lionel Crescendo Sehoun

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maximenne Amontcha,
Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)

Reviewer 2: Bernadette Sabi Lolo,
Laboratoire de Cartographie (LaCarto), Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC)

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: 05/09/20	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Connaissances, Perceptions et attitudes des populations sur les services écosystémiques des espaces verts des villes de Cotonou, Abomey-Calavi et Allada : Implications pour la gestion durable des forêts urbaines et péri-urbaines**	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) **The title is clearly Claire but does not reflect what is in the text. After reading we always remain on the feeling of dissatisfaction especially on the perceptions of the populations**	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) These three parts are not necessarily respected in the summary	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) **The document still contains some grammar errors**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) **No the methodology is not clear The software used is not mentioned nor the calculations explained**	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) No, the text is more about urban forestry than the ecosystem services of green spaces	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) **No supported by the content**	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
(Please insert your comments) ***A significant effort is made on this part***	

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):

Pour le résumé respecter la forme et les parties d'un résumé.

Pour l'introduction énoncer clairement votre sujet pour que celui qui lit puisse comprendre dès le début de quoi vous voulez parler : services écosystémiques ou la foresterie urbaine ?

Pour la méthodologie beaucoup de précisions sont à compléter

Pour ce qui des résultats, certaines informations sont inutiles et les informations nécessaires sont absentes. Faire ressortir clairement par exemple la perception.

Votre conclusion doit comporter en une phrase les différents résultats auxquels vous êtes parvenus.