

Paper: “Caractérisation phytosociologique des anciens sites de traitements sylvicoles et de la réserve naturelle dans le parc national du Banco (Abidjan-Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 31 March 2022

Accepted: 29 June 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Konan Affoue Patricia

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kwassi Dauphner Serges S. Amani
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	5
Oui le titre est clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Oui le résumé est Acceptable	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Bien qu'il existe mais les fautes ne sont pas nombreuses	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Excellent	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Excellent	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Oui c'est parfait	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Oui bien illustré	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

RAS

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 25/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation phytosociologique des anciens sites de traitements sylvicoles et de la réserve naturelle dans le parc national du Banco (Abidjan-Côte d'Ivoire).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 25.04.2022	
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/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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Le titre est acceptable mais la démarche est plus axée sur l'évolution de l'association à <i>Turraeanthus africanus</i> et <i>Heisteria parvifolia</i> suite à des activités anthropiques. De ce fait, un autre titre plus accrocheur peut être envisageable.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les objectifs et les résultats sont assez clairs. Les méthodes sont détaillées dans le texte mais elles ne sont même pas brièvement décrites dans le résumé. On apprend seulement que la phytosociologie synusiale. Il est intéressant de donner un bref aperçu sur cette méthode ainsi que sur les logiciels utilisés. La problématique doit être clarifiée par une phrase dans ce résumé.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Plusieurs fautes mineures à corriger. Quelques expressions à reformuler. (Voir les commentaires dans le texte. Certaines citations n'ont pas de liens évidents avec le sujet.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est clairement explicitée dans le texte.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Revoir dans les résultats les combinaisons spécifiques les noms des auteurs.	
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plusieurs auteurs ont été cités dans le texte mais ne figurent pas dans les références bibliographiques. • Les normes APA ne sont parfois pas respectées. • Réactualiser votre manuscrit par des références plus récentes si possibles car elles sont plutôt anciennes. 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La discussion paraît un peu décousue et mérite d'être mieux structurée pour comprendre les processus de mise en place des nouveaux syntagmes à partir du syntagme originel. La problématique doit être plus étayée. Certains aspects mentionnés dans le texte nécessitent également des clarifications ou justifications.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: le manuscrit peut être publié après prise en compte des observations et corrections.