

Paper: “Floristic and Structural Study of the Dahliafleur Partial Nature Reserve Located in Bingerville (South Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 26 September 2022

Accepted: 19 June 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Missa Koffi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p23](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p23)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1 Soro Dramane

Reviewer 2: Coulibaly Siendou

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: Dramane SORO	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon COULIBALY/ Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 07 octobre 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 Octobre 2022
Manuscript Title: Floristic and Structural Study of the Dahliafleur Partial Nature Reserve Located in Bingerville (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1042/22	
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.	5
The title is clear and is adequate with the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is clearly presents objects, methods and results.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
This article is well writed	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, The authors are clearly explained methods</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes, the results are clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, the conclusions or summary are correctly write.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>yes</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):

No Comments and suggestions for author

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No Comments and suggestions for Editor

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: Siendou Coulibaly	
University/Country: Jean Lorougnon Guédé University	
Date Manuscript Received: 2022/10/07	Date Review Report Submitted: 2022/10/15
Manuscript Title: Floristic and Structural Study of the Dahliafleu Partial Nature Reserve Located in Bingerville (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1042/22	
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>Proposed title</i> <i>Floristic and Structural Study of the Dahliafleu Partial Nature Reserve Located in Bingerville (South Côte d'Ivoire)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Add a closing sentence to the end.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p><i>Study site</i> -<i>The card presented is not explicit enough.</i> -<i>Information must also be provided on the climate and vegetation in the middle of the study.</i></p> <p><i>Collection of data</i> -<i>Why this unequal distribution of plots in the three areas?</i> -<i>all species</i> were inventoried... Have you inventoried the herb species? -<i>Specify the botanical nomenclature used to identify plant species.</i> -<i>circumferences of all woody species... of all woody individuals</i></p> <p><i>Data analysis</i> <i>Specific richness : Add bibliographic reference to support this method.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
- <i>Some of the percentages cited in the text are not consistent with those in figure 2.</i> - <i>The class of 55 and more... This class does not exist in Figure 3.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The Aracea, however predominant, are forgotten.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Overall, the references are recent, appropriate and fairly well presented.</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):

In the Discussion, the authors should also explain the predominance of Araceae and Apocynaceae.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: