

Paper: “Évaluation de Stocks de Semence de *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A. Rich. (Ebenaceae): Une Espèce en Forte Régression au Niger”

Submitted: 13 June 2022

Accepted: 05 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Ado Ali

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p142](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p142)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdou Laouali
Niger

Reviewer 2: Traore Saran
Université Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Kouame Koffi Félix
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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: ABDOU Laouali	
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Évaluation de stocks de semence de <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> Hochst. ex A. Rich., une espèce en forte régression au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38_06_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
The title is clear and it is adequate	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract good	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes but the authors can correct it	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methods are explained clearly	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Yes	

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):

Minor revision is needed, see the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No Comment

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: TRAORE Saran	
University/Country: Université Nazi BONI/ Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 06/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Évaluation de stocks de semence cas de <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> Hochst. ex A. Rich. une espèce en forte régression au Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: -38.06.2022-	
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.	2
According to the title the authors should assess the soil seed banks (the amount of seeds that could be stocked on the soil surface) focused on the seeds of <i>Diospyros</i>	

mespiliformis a woody species of which the populations are declining in Niger. Unfortunately, authors rather investigated the seed production capacity (potential) of *D. mespiliformis* individuals through phytogeographical zones.

The ms title (Évaluation de stocks de semence cas de *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A. Rich. une espèce en forte régression au Niger) is different from that of the abstract (Evaluation of seed stocks of *Diospyros mespiliformis* Hochst. ex A. Rich. a species in sharp decline in Niger)

I'm sorry, the ms title does not reflect the ms content.

The ms title is not linked to the study objective,

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

2

(Please insert your comments)

The résumé (158 words) and Abstract (162 words) are not clearly written.

The abstract is difficult to read and understand. May authors check abstract for English language and also re-edit both of “résumé” and abstract sections.

The objectives of Résumé : évaluer les stocks des semences dans les sols pour contribuer à la maîtrise des contraintes liées à la régénération naturelle ;

Abstract (to assess seed stocks in soils to contribute to the knowledge of the difficulties related to natural regeneration *D. mespiliformis*) are totally different from each other ; and from that stated in **Introduction** : contribuer à la connaissance des difficultés liées à la régénération naturelle de *D. mespiliformis* à travers de collectes d'informations robustes.

There are three different objectives in this ms. There are no specific objectives for this study

Question: How did authors work with three different objectives and without any specific objectives?

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

2

(Please insert your comments)

Introduction: Some sentences are disconnected: ex. “D’origine Afrique tropicale sauf en zone humide, *Diospyros mespiliformis* est très répandu, car il s’étend du Sénégal jusqu’en Erythrée, en Ethiopie et au Kenya (Auteur, année ?). Vers le sud on le trouve jusqu’en Namibie, au nord de l’Afrique du Sud et au Swaziland, mais il est presque absent des zones de forêt plus humides d’Afrique de l’Ouest et centrale (Arbonier, 2000). On le trouve également au Yémen. Elle présente une différence morphologique en fruit et en feuilles suivant les zone phytogéographique (Gnonlonfin et al., 2022).”

Ex ; « D’une part, elle très prisée par la population rurale car utilisée dans tous les services écosystémiques et d’autre parts l’espèce est en régression (Ahmed et al., 2017 ; Ali., et al 2020) nécessitant la clarification des causes de cette régression »

This constitutes 2 different observations and not opposite. Please re-edit.

The work objective is not clearly stated comparing with the title and MS content.

The MS title is not linked to study objective, ms content

- Page numbers are missing as well as line number.

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>In the section « Matériel et methods/ Collecte des données »: the criteria used to record to discriminate adult and young individuals are missing.</p> <p>“Au niveau de toutes les parcelles, nous avons procédé à un comptage systématique de tous les rejets , il s’agit des jeunes plants issus de la régénération par graines, par bouturage et par drageonnage...)</p> <p>par bouturage suppose an assisted regeneration (planting an organ) instead of natural</p> <p>Why did authors consider and only count “rejets” ?</p> <p>I’m sorry, this section is not clearly written. The method used is not well explained</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>I’m sorry, I did not evaluated this section due to the lack of linkage between the study objectives and methods.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>As conclusion authors wrote : « Les résultats de nos travaux mettent en évidence une faible densité de <i>D. mespiliformis</i> d’autant plus faible dans les milieux plus anthropisés (champs et jardins). Le peuplement est caractérisé par une faible régénération naturelle. »</p> <p>There is no link between study objectives and conclusion</p>	
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study topic is very interesting and is of great interest for forest regeneration and biodiversity conservation: This work could make an interesting paper for ESJ, but there is still a lot of work to make the paper more easily readable and more convincing. It needs a substantial revision of statistical procedures.

I suggest authors rewrite the ms title as « Évaluation des stocks de semences de *Diospyros mespiliformis*, ébène d’Afrique des sols au Niger »

I would invite authors to re-edit their ms with more linkage between: 1- ideas/sentences in the introduction; clearly state the reason of this study; study objectives (general and specific)

2- the different sections : objectives, methods, results and conclusion

After that, they could submit it as new project.

Decision: The MS is not ready to be published

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The study topic is very interesting and is of great interest for researcher: This work could make an interesting paper for ESJ, but there is still a lot of work to make the paper more easily readable and statistically more convincing. It needs a substantial revision.

The work objectives are not clearly stated comparing with that noted in résumé, abstract and conclusion.

The conclusion is not related to study objectives

Authors must undertake a complete and thorough revision of the manuscript.

Decision: I reject the MS because it is not ready to be published

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: 22/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/07/2022
Manuscript Title: Evaluation of seed stocks of <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> Hochst. ex A. Rich. a species in sharp decline in Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0638/22	
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.	3
<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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5
<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	<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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: