

Paper: “Détermination du Potentiel Pastoral Herbacé de la Commune Rurale de Dièma dans le Bioclimat Soudanien Nord au Mali”

Submitted: 19 August 2022

Accepted: 18 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: KANAMBAYE Boureima

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p165](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p165)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Joseph YOKA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Rachid Ismaili

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: 14 September 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 September 2022
Manuscript Title: Détermination du potentiel pastoral herbacé dans le bioclimat soudanien nord au Mali : Cas de la commune rurale de Diéma	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0915/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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
<i>The title is topical and fits well with the objective and content of the work.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The summary clearly presents the objective of the study, the methods applied and</i>	

<i>the main results. However, the author should emphasise in the summary that the pastoral value has been calculated. Some values need to be specified.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The manuscript is well written. There are not enough spelling and grammatical mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Some study methods need to be clearly explained and the sources of information need to be supplemented. The methods used are appropriate, but the authors should improve their presentation with clear references.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear, but with some errors in presentation. Some results need to be interpreted for their value. Other results need a good presentation to better make comparisons between the study sites. There are some passages that should be removed from the results because they are already mentioned in the methods.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is relevant to the content of the work, but it is too long. It should be synthetic and highlight the main results. The conclusion should highlight the scientific and socio-economic interest of the work carried out. It should therefore be improved.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are appropriate but should be submitted in accordance with the journal's instructions to authors.</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):

Authors should take into account any comments made directly in the manuscript for its improvement. After the suggested corrections, the article can be returned to the journal for publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The submitted article is of good quality. After the suggested corrections, the article can 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!

Reviewer Name: Rachid ISMAILI	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Détermination du potentiel pastoral herbacé dans le bioclimat soudanien nord au Mali : Cas de la commune rurale de Dièma	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>No comments</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>No comments</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>No comments</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>No comments</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>No comments</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Il faut ajouter des perspectives pour votre travail de recherche</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Il faut chercher des références bibliographiques plus récentes (>2020)</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 to the Editors Only:

NO

