

Manuscript: **“Farmers’ perceptions of the impacts of *Adansonia digitata* L. leaves exploitation on its conservation and on livelihoods of local communities in Mali, West Africa”**

**Submitted: 13 October 2020**

**Accepted: 13 April 2021**

**Published: 30 April 2021**

Corresponding Author: Kapoury Sanogo

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n13p41

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Valentin Marian Antohi, Dunarea de Jos of Galati, Romania

# ***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: Valentin Marian Antohi	
University/Country: Dunarea de Jos of Galati/Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 23.02.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.02.2021
Manuscript Title: <i>Farmers' perceptions of the impacts of Adansonia digitata L. leaves exploitation on its conservation and on livelihoods of local communities in Mali, West Africa</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10108/20	
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>	<b>Rating Result</b> [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>The title is appropriate with the study.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Study objectives are defined, in the abstract and in the article. The research methodology is not presented in detail. The results are correlated with the</i>	

<i>objectives and conclusions.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The article is generally well written. As I am not a native English speaker, I am unable to correct the grammatical errors.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The methodology is well written and argued.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Presenting the body of the paper, in accordance with the introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure. The objectives are presented from the introduction, work hypotheses are not presented or demonstrated in the results chapter.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion part does not specify the limitations of the study.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The bibliographical sources are adequate, but are relatively outdated, it is necessary to complete the study with newer sources.</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):**