Manuscript: **"Espèces Ligneuses de Savanes Sèches du Nord du Togo : Considérations Socioculturelles et Relations de Pouvoir des Parties Prenantes"**

Corresponding Author: Bériname Badjar

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan, Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly de Korhogo, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021*

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: 30/01/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **ESPÈCES LIGNEUSES DE SAVANES SÈCHES DU NORD TOGO : CONSIDÉRATIONS SOCIOCULTURELLES ET RELATIONS DE POUVOIR DES PARTIES PRENANTES**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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: 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(The title is clearly and adequate to the content of the article)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	**4**

results.	
(The abstract is acceptable)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
*(*There are fewer grammar and vocabulary mistakes*)*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**3**
(The study methods are not clearly explained)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
*(***The results are so lengthy***)*	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
(The conclusion are accurate and supported by the content but it is so lengthy)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(The references are comprehensive and are clearly written)	

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):

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document