

Manuscript: “**Impacts de l’envahissement de *Sida cordifolia* L. sur la diversité herbacée d’un parcours pastoral sahélien : la vallée du Goulbi N’Kaba de Mayahi au Niger**”

Submitted: 26 August 2021

Accepted: 27 February 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: **Laouali Abdou**

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p319

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdelfettah MAOUNI, Abdelmalek Essaadi University- Morocco

Reviewer 2: Soro Yénilougo, Université Nangui Abrogoua/ Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Diomande Awa, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Noupe Diakaria Coulibaly, University/Country: Cnra 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: Abdelfettah MAOUNI	Email :
University/Country: Abdelmalek Essaadi University- Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/08/2021 18:56	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/08/2021 11:10
Manuscript Title: Impacts of the invasion of Sida cordifolia L. on the herbaceous diversity of a Sahelian pastoral range: the Goulbi N’Kaba valley of Mayahi in Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0931/21	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Travail intéressant d'actualité sur la biodiversité. Toutefois, il est bien souhaitable d'évoquer :

- Dans l'introduction que *Sida cordifolia* est considéré une mauvaise herbe pour certains, mais pour d'autres c'est une plante Médicinale et également une plante industrielle (Fibres).
- Dans la discussion, comment cette plante empêche le développement des autres espèces et par conséquent diminuer la biodiversité
- La solution : lutte mécanique ou lutte biologique par une autre plante ou

exploitation ???

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Soro Yénilougo	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Impacts de l'envahissement de <i>Sida cordifolia</i> L. sur la diversité herbacée d'un parcours pastoral sahélien : la vallée du Goulbi N'Kaba de Mayahi au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0931/21	
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	4

article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<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.	2
<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):

Article bon dans l'ensemble mais necessite quelques petites réglages

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: NOUPE DIAKARIA COULIBALY	
University/Country: CNRA CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/02/2022
Manuscript Title: Impacts de l'envahissement de Sida cordifolia L. sur la diversité herbacée d'un parcours pastoral sahélien : la vallée du Goulbi N'Kaba de Mayahi au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 31 09 2021	
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.	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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	3
<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	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Il suffira pour les auteurs de prendre en compte quelques remarques

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is about for the authors to take only into account the corrections made and everything will be OK.