

Paper: “Les facteurs anthropiques de la dégradation des mangroves d’Angondjé, Okala et Mikolongo au nord du Grand Libreville”

Submitted: 06 December 2021

Accepted: 13 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Laetitia Guylia Rogombe

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p186](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p186)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Douzo Jolie-Wanesse Danielle
Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Cocody Abidjan Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Bignoumba Guy-Serge
Université Omar Bongo, Gabon

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: Douzo Jolie-Wanesse Danielle	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouët Boigny Cocody Abidjan Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/05/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/05/22
Manuscript Title: Les facteurs anthropiques de la dégradation des mangroves d'Okala, Angondjé et Mikolongo au nord du Grand Libreville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1265/22	
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.	4
<i>The title is clear and adequate of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The drafting of the summary is so good. It complied with the essential elements (objects, methods and results) but review the results section</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Grammar and spelling mistakes in this article are rare</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Study methods are explained clearly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are generally clear and not contain errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusion or summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>References are complete and appropriate. There are in this work as many old as young references</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):

- The results are not very explicit. it will be necessary to state in the results the type, practices, factors of degradation and the degree of pollution in the different study areas
- Revise the caption of the pictures it will be necessary to put the titles of the pictures under the pictures and not above the pictures
- On picture 1, 2, 3 the names of the sites are illegible as well as the scale

- Check if the document is the original you submitted because on page 8, the presence of yellow marker
- The document is not paginated

- Since in the bibliographic references the page number from which the reference for the discussion is taken is given, it would be wise to remove the pages in the text and keep just the authors.

- **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

There are a few remarks that I mentioned above

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: 19 avril 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 06 mai 2022
Manuscript Title: Les facteurs anthropiques de la dégradation des mangroves d'Okala, Angondjé et Mikolongo au nord du Grand Libreville	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 65.12.2021	
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.	5
<i>(Le titre de l'article est clair. Il est conforme à son contenu)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Dans l'ensemble, le résumé est correctement présenté. Toutefois,, si la méthodologie est suffisamment claire, les résultats gagneraient à être mieux exprimés. et les objectifs clairement décliné).</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Il y a peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans le texte)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(La méthode de recherche est clairement présentée)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Les résultats sont clairement exposés. Ils sont conformes à l'objet de l'étude mentionné dans l'introduction)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Il y a cohérence entre le résumé, la conclusion et le contenu)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Les références sont appropriés. Elles demandent cependant à être complétées car certains auteurs mentionnés dans la bibliographie n'ont pas été appelés dans le texte. Les auteurs sont invités à s'assurer de la cohérence entre la bibliographie et les citations)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Au-delà des observations portées tout au long du texte, cette réflexion est bien menée dans l'ensemble. Elle aborde une question d'intérêt majeur, à savoir la préservation d'un des écosystèmes les plus riches en biodiversité au monde, et au Gabon en particulier, et fournisseur d'une diversité de services écosystémiques.

Le texte est bien écrit et bien structurée. La méthodologie, claire et concise rend bien compte de la démarche suivie pour la collecte des données sur le terrain. Toutefois, le résumé gagnerait à être affiné en exprimant plus clairement les objectifs de l'étude, la problématique, les hypothèses, et les résultats. Ceci est également valable pour l'introduction générale par un rappel des objectifs, problématique et méthodologie. Il est recommandé de s'assurer de la correspondance entre la bibliographie et les références convoquées dans le texte.