

Manuscript: “**Dynamique du carbone organique du sol et de l’azote dans une chronoséquence de plantation de *Acacia auriculiformis* A. Cunn. ex Benth. (Fabaceae), à Bambou-Mingali (République du Congo)**”

Submitted: 10 January 2022

Accepted: 02 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2022

Corresponding Author: Suspense Warned Ifo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p172](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n8p172)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Pr. ZAPFACK Louis, Cameroun

Reviewer 2: Gamién Konan Bah Modeste, University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé – Daloa 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: Pr. ZAPFACK Louis	
University/Country: Cameroun	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 janv. 2022
Manuscript Title: Soil organic carbon and nitrogen dynamics in a chronosequence of <i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> A. Cunn. ex Benth. (Fabaceae), at Bamboo-Mingali (Republic of Congo)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <u>682.23113</u>	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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 mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	yes
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: GNAMIEN KONAN BAH MODESTE	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE JEAN LOROUGNON GUEDE – DALOA COTE D’IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/01/2022
Dynamique du carbone organique du sol et de l’azote dans une chronoséquence de plantation d’ <i>Acacia auriculiformis</i> A. Cunn. ex Benth. (Fabaceae), à Bambou-Mingali (République du Congo).	
ESJ Manuscript Number : Paper for review 0160/22	
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 published version 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
Le titre est clair et reflète le contenu.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

Le résumé présente clairement les objectifs, les méthodes et les résultats. Mais il n'est pas nécessaire d'évoquer l'objectif spécifique dans le résumé.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Les erreurs grammaticales sont moindres.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Dans l'introduction, les informations sont trop générales. Le site de l'étude n'est pas nommé. Veuillez nommer le site de l'étude et réduire les informations générales et insérer des informations sur le site de l'étude (Ses caractéristiques, ce qui justifie son choix....) En faisant ressortir clairement le problème. Le site de l'étude doit être également nommé dans la partie matériel et méthodes ainsi que les critères de choix des parcelles.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Les résultats sont clairs	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
La conclusion est bien conduite mais le résumé mérite d'être réajusté en fonction des observations mentionnées plus haut.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Les références sont appropriées	

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):

J'encourage auteurs à prendre en compte toutes les suggestions.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Merci pour la confiance renouvelée.