

Manuscript: “**Étude Ethnobotanique Des Plantes Spontanées Comestibles Dans Le Département De Zuénoula (Centre-Ouest De La Côte D’ivoire)**”

Submitted: 06 February 2021

Accepted: 27 April 2021

Published: 31 August 2021

Corresponding Author: Vanié-Bi Irié Germain

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n29p242

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Noufou Doudjo Ouattara
Unviversité Nangui Abrogoua

Reviewer 2: Kanga Yao
Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Kassi N’Dja Justin
Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Donthy Kouakoubah Richard Kouakou
Unité de Formation et de Recherche Sciences de la Nature, Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

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 Noufou Doudjo OUATTARA	
University/Country: Unviversité NANGUI ABROGOUA	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: ETUDE ETHNOBOTANIQUE DES PLANTES COMESTIBLES SPONTANÉES DANS LE DÉPARTEMENT DE ZUÉNOULA (CENTRE-OUEST DE LA CÔTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is good. Its fit with the body of the text</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract is clear and concise</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The text is well written. There few grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are well presented</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes but, the names of the journal must be written in the same way</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):

RAS

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: KANGA YAO	
University/Country: Université peleforo Gon Coulibaly/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:02/03/21	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0270/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No (Oui)	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No (OUI)	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No (Oui)	

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
<i>Le titre est en accord avec le contenu de l'article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	4

mistakes in this article.	
<i>Il n'y a pas d'erreur au niveau de la grammaire</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2,5
<i>Pas bien presenter la méthode</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Il faut prendre en compte toutes les remarques et bien présenter la méthodologie en intégrant les corrections

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: 02 / 03/ 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 / 03/ 2021
Manuscript Title: ETUDE ETHNOBOTANIQUE DES PLANTES COMESTIBLES SPONTANÉES DANS LE DÉPARTEMENT DE ZUÉNOULA (CENTRE-OUEST DE LA COTE D'IVOIRE)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: review 0270/21	
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.

<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
Le titre énonce le problème étudié. Le titre est clair et concis et met bien en valeur le contenu de l'étude.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Le résumé est bien concis	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Les méthode décrites par les auteurs permettent à un spécialiste de reproduire cette même recherche. Donc acceptable.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les résultats majeurs sont insuffisants. Les données ont été bien exploitées.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Les auteurs ont bien dégagé la conclusion.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Les références bibliographiques sont pertinentes mais doivent se conformer aux instructions aux auteurs de la revue European Scientific Journal.	

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):

Les références bibliographiques sont pertinentes **mais** doivent se conformer aux instructions aux auteurs de la revue European Scientific Journal.



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: 02/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Etude ethnobotanique des plantes comestibles spontanées dans le Département de Zuénoula (Centre-Ouest de la Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Good</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Good</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>fairly good</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Good</i>	

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>fairly good</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>fairly good</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>fairly good</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):

La discussion doit être revue entièrement. Elle n'est pas bien menée par moment.