

Paper: “Caractéristiques Phytoécologiques des Groupements Végétaux Ligneux des Formations Naturelles à *Balanites aegyptiaca* (L.) Del. dans le Centre-Est du Niger”

Submitted: 07 September 2022

Accepted: 28 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Abdou Habou M. Kamal

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p333](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n33p333)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kaka Kiari Boukar K

Reviewer 2: Pierre R.A.R

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: KAKA KIARI Boukar Kéllou	
University/Country: Université de Diffa-Niger	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/09/2022
Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques phytoécologiques des groupements végétaux ligneux des formations naturelles à <i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i> (L.) Del. dans le Centre-Est du Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0969/22	
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>(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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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 author must obligatorily insert the observations and the remarks, before being published this article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Thanks.

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: Professor RADJI Raoufou	
University/Country: Université de Lomé / Togo	
Date Manuscript Received: 2022/10/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 2022/10/27
Manuscript Title: Caractéristiques phytoécologiques des groupements végétaux ligneux des formations naturelles à <i>Balanites aegyptiaca</i> (L.) Del. dans le Centre-Est du Niger	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 69.09.2022	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<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> Some grammatical errors to be corrected in the text	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Clearly defined and clearly presented	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results clearly described but suggestions was made into the text	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>References are appropriate but restrictive. Suggestions are made into the text</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):

Paper well documented but can be improved according to the recommendations and suggestions made into the text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: Paper can be published in the next version.