

Manuscript: “**Macrophytes Du Lac Iro Au Tchad : Diversité, Typologie Phytosociologique Et Pressions**”

**Submitted: 24 September 2020**

**Accepted: 24 November 2020**

**Published: 31 December 2020**

Corresponding Author: Goy Saradoum

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p105

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Dr. Edmond Sylvestre Miabangana,  
Herbier National Du Congo (Iec), Brazzaville, République Du Congo

**Reviewer 2:** Dauphner Amani,  
University Félix Houphouet Boigny

**Reviewer 3:** Yenilougo Soro,  
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

**Reviewer 4:** Adéréwa A. M. Amontcha Yabi ,  
Université D’abomey-Calavi (Bénin)

**Reviewer 5:** Blinded

## ***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: Dr. Edmond Sylvestre MIABANGANA	Email:
University/Country: Herbar National du Congo (IEC), Brazzaville, République du Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/10/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Macrophytes du lac Iro au Tchad : diversité, typologie phytosociologique et pressions.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1039/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> OK	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Quelques corrections ont été apportées au résumé. Dans l'ensemble le résumé est clair	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

(Please insert your comments)

De nombreuses fautes d'orthographe mineures sont décelées et corrigées dans le texte. Les mots ou expressions en surlignage violet, sont à élaguer du texte. Ceux en surlignage vert sont à intégrer.

**4. The study methods are explained clearly.**

**4**

(Please insert your comments)

Dans tout travail d'intérêt écologique, la position phytogéographique du site d'étude mérite d'être mentionné. Le Tchad ne dispose pas d'une esquisse phytogéographique, intégrée au Système de White (1986) ? Rien n'est signalé même dans l'introduction.

La méthodologie ne fait pas mention de l'approche taxonomique utilisée (traditionnelle, phylogénétique ?). Il faut en mentionner brièvement. Si elle est cladistique, prière de se référer à la dernière version (APG IV, 2016).

Certains termes, tels Hydrophyte, Hélophyte, méritent aussi d'être expliqués pour des lecteurs moins aguerris à cette terminologie. En plus la distribution phytogéographique de chaque espèce serait un indicateur de la répartition spatiale des groupements identifiés par la suite.

Le logiciel PAST est un outil performant pour les dendrogrammes, ce qui aurait bien affiner les résultats.

**5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

**4**

(Please insert your comments)

A mon humble avis, et sans caractère d'obligation les résultats sur la phytodiversité seraient articulés comme suit :

- Richesse floristique (avec diversité des familles reprise au tableau 3.) ;
- Groupements végétaux ;
- Indices de diversité.

Quelques aménagements taxonomiques sur les idiotaxons (Référentiel taxonomique de Lebrun & Stork (1991-2015) :

**CYPERACEAE**

*Pycneus mundtii* Nees

**ONAGRACEAE**

*Ludwigia stolonifera* (Guill. & Perr.) P.H. Raven

Voir sous : *Ludwigia adscendens* subsp. *diffusa* (Forssk.) P.H. Raven

**POACEAE**

*Paspalidium geminatum* (Forssk.) Stapf

Voir sous : *Setaria geminata* (Forssk.) Veldkamp

Dans une combinaison spécifique, le(s) nom (s) du (es) parrain (s) n'est (ne) (sont) pas en italique. Il en est des unités infraspécifiques tel subsp.

Quelques aménagements syntaxonomiques :

Lorsque l'association a été déjà décrite et validée, n'utiliser plus le terme groupement. Il est préférable de parler de l'association à *Vossia cuspidata* ou Le *Vossietum cuspidatae* (Vanderyst 1932) Lebrun 1947.

Deux classes de végétations structurent vos groupements du lac :

**Potametea Tüxen et Preising 1942** (pour les hydrophytes, ex : *Cerathophyllum demersum*, *Azolla pinnata* subsp. *africana*)

**Phragmitetea Tüxen et Preising 1942** (pour les héliophytes, ex : *Ipomoea rubens* Choisy, *Cyperus laevigatus* L.

Vous ne faites ressortir que la classe de *Potametea* Tüxen et Preising 1942. Une balance entre les deux classes serait un indicateur sur la dynamique de ces groupements (Spectres).

Compléments des parrains dans la combinaison syntaxonomique :

*Vossietum cuspidatae* (Vanderyst 1932) Lebrun 1947

*Phragmitetum australis* (Lebrun 1947) nom.mut.

#### **Discussion :**

Robyns (1936) mentionne la présence des prairies aquatiques à *Echinochloa stagnina* (Retz) P. Beauv., sans toute la région de Coquilatville dans l'ex Congo belge. Ce dernier l'élève au rang d'association, ainsi dénommée *Echinochloetum stagninae*.

La dernière synthèse de Schmitz (1988) ne la valide pas comme association à part entière. L'espèce se trouve dans une combinaison avec *Leptochloa coeruleascens* Steud. La révision donne ainsi *Leptochloo- Echinochloetum stagninae* (Léonard 1950) Mandango (1982) 1987. Il faut généralement considérer le document le plus récent.

**6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.**

**4**

*(Please insert your comments)*

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

**4**

*(Please insert your comments)*

- Ranger quelques auteurs par ordre alphabétique :

Beaux, 1998

Bechir *et al*, 2019

Ndour, 2019 ;

Noumon *et al*., 2015

- Bien préciser l'année de parution entre Blondel, (1976) dans le texte et Blondel (1979) dans les références.

- Dans le texte lire : Syed **et al.**, 2018 au lieu de Syed (2018).
- Deux références sont introuvables dans le texte :

- Amngar, G., Hamit, A. & Deschamps P. (2017). Caractérisation des paramètres physico-chimiques des eaux souterraines ; implication pour l'évaluation des potentialités des ressources en eau du bassin hydrogéologique de la région du Lac Iro (République du Tchad). Colloque international : « Recherches croisées sur les écosystèmes lacustres tchadiens » 8-33.

- Lemoalle, J., Bader, J-C., Leblanc, M. & Sedick A. (2012). Recent changes in Lake Chad: observations, simulations and management options (1973-2011), *Global and Planetary Change* 80-81: 247-254.

**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):**

C'est un travail original qui vient d'élargir la connaissance sur la distribution spatiale de quelques syntaxons. Intégrer quelques annotations dans le texte. Ce travail pourrait être approfondi par la suite, par la capacité du pouvoir d'oxygénation des plantes et par ricochet le pouvoir dépolluant.



# ***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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Macrophytes from Lake Iro in Chad: diversity, phytosociological typology and pressures.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>Paper for review 1039/20</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: 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>2</b>
Le titre est bien illustré mais le mot macrophyte doit être à revoir. Je le pense bien !	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

Oui le résumé contient toutes les étapes mais il y a quelques erreurs à prendre en compte	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
Quelques erreurs de grammaire à revoir	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
Bonne méthodologie	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
Il y a des erreurs que nous avons soulignées dans le document. Elles doivent être prises en compte pendant la correction.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Rien à signaler	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
Revoir l'écriture des articles et les revues	

**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):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

RAS

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Introduction

# ***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: Soro yenilougo	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03/11/2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Macrophytes du lac Iro au Tchad : diversité, typologie phytosociologique et pressions.</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---39.10.2020---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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</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 body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(texte bien rédigé, mais quelques petites erreurs)</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</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):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

# ***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: <b>Adéréwa A. M. AMONTCHA YABI</b>	
University/Country: <b>Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>27/10/2020</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>07/11/2020</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Macrophytes du lac Iro au Tchad : diversité, typologie phytosociologique et pressions</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>39.10.2020</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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]
<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>L'aspect « pression » n'a réellement pas été développé dans le document</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Quelques suites non logiques ont été soulignées dans le document.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>L'approche méthodologique nécessite une petite restructuration.</b>	
<b>L'aspect « pression » abordé dans la discussion et dans la conclusion n'a pas été développé dans la partie résultat.</b>	
<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>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Il y a des références incomplètes (nom incomplet dans le texte, absence du nombre de page dans la référence)</b>	

**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):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

Restructuration de la méthodologie

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Donner les coordonnées géographiques de tout l'espace du lac et non de son centre.  
Développer proprement l'aspect « pression » ou l'enlever du « titre », de la « discussion » et de la « conclusion »