

Manuscript: “**Phytosociology Of Echinops Giganteus In The Western Highland Of Cameroon**”

Submitted: 23 October 2020

Accepted: 23 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Christiana Ngyete Nyikob Mbogue

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p345

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer4: 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:	
University/Country:	

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Phytosociology of <i>Echinopsgiganteus</i> in the Western Highland of Cameroon	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1135/20	
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.	4
<i>The title fits with the content and structure of the manuscript.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The Abstract provides information about the subject approached, about the research method and about the results obtained.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Once the corrections are implemented, then the manuscript will become acceptable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are derived from the application of the method on the starting knowledge corpus.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The bibliography does not contain references from the interval 208-2020.</i>	

--

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):

It is required that

- 1) the corrections to be finally implemented in the manuscript;
- 2) to complete the bibliography with references from 2018, 2019, 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:04/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/12/2020
Manuscript Title: Phytosociology of <i>Echinops giganteus</i> in the Western Highland of Cameroon.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 35.11.2020	
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.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title should be modify in order to take in account the diversity analyses section	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This section need slight modifications. The required parts are well given, see manuscript..	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, see inside the manuscript with the tracking modifications tool	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, but the site description need some modifications, see manuscript	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes in part, the results are well presented, but this section need to be better structured in subsections. The discussion is partly relatively poor in the first part concerning biodiversity. The authors should densify it before publication.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, they reflect the results, very few errors	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Important in number and appropriately used.	

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):

The topic is interesting, but the authors must restructure the result section, and present clearly the two main parts and the discussion of each.