

Manuscript: “**Richesse De La Flore Ligneuse Exploitable Et Planification Des Émissions Du CO2 Dans Une Forêt De Production Du Mayombe Congolais**”

Submitted: 20 October 2021

Accepted: 12 March 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Felix Koubouana

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p75

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr Aubin Armel KOUMBA, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (CENAREST) / GABON

Reviewer 2: Gnamien Konan Bah

Reviewer 3: Pr. ZAPFACK Louis, Cameroon

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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 Aubin Armel KOUMBA	
University/Country: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (CENAREST) / GABON	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: PLANIFICATION DES EMISSIONS DU CO₂ DANS UNE FORET DE PRODUCTION DU MAYOMBE CONGOLAIS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0404/22	
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 “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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est conforme au contenu de l'article. Toutefois, il serait bien que l'auteur y ajoute les aspects liés à la composition floristique (voir les	

commentaires du reviewer).	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> L'objectif est clairement précisé. Mais, les autres éléments du résumé sont à revoir et à compléter (voir les commentaires du reviewer).	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le travail est assez bien rédigé même si quelques coquilles et fautes restent à corriger.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Cette partie est à re-travailler afin de permettre .aux autres de reproduire la méthodologie que vous avez utilisé de manière plus aisée et sans ambiguïté.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats obtenus sont bien présentés. Mais, à certains endroits, il convient de corriger et rectifier plusieurs choses comme indiqué dans le manuscrit corrigé. S'agissant de la discussion, il faut bien interpréter vos résultats saillants et les comparer avec les travaux d'autres personnes. Donc cette section « Discussion » est à revoir et à élaborer davantage afin d'améliorer la qualité du manuscrit.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion est assez bien rédigée. Elle est en rapport avec le corps du texte.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Une bibliographie pauvre (n=19) avec des références trop vieilles (la plus récente datant de 2018, soit plus de 5 ans); Ajouter 5 à 7 articles pertinents, plus récents et en rapport avec le sujet, publiés dans des revues scientifiques.	

--

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):

Travail assez bien élaboré dans sa globalité.

Revoir le résumé, la discussion et la conclusion.

Bien se conformer aux “Instructions aux auteurs” de la revue ESJ.

Rédiger le manuscrit en utilisant le modèle fourni par ESJ (à télécharger sur le site d’ESJ)

Enrichir les références de cet article avec des publications plus récentes: 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 2022-03-24	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: PLANIFICATION DES EMISSIONS DU CO₂ DANS UNE FORET DE PRODUCTION DU MAYOMBE CONGOLAIS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---04.04.2022---	
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> It is clear as title	
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.	5
<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	4

by the content.	
<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	good
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The discussion have few authors try to reinforce

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The use of Blood is not fair