EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Impact de l'Orpaillage sur les Ecosystemes Forestiers du Secteur de Souanke, Republique du Congo"**

Submitted: 22 May 2022
Accepted: 10 November 2022
Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Noël Watha-Ndoudy

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p169

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: YAO Koffi Alexandre, University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)

Reviewer 2: Aderewa Amontcha

Reviewer 3: Kouakou Gains K. KPAN

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: YAO Koffi Alexandre	
University/Country: Université Félix Houphouet Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/10/2022
Manuscript Title: **IMPACT DE L'ORPAILLAGE SUR LE MILIEU PHYSIQUE DES ECOSYSTEMES FORESTIERS DU SECTEUR DE SOUANKE, REPUBLIQUE DU CONGO**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0603/22	
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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
Titre adapté	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**4**
Le résumé est bien mené	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
Je relève de longues phrases qui n'entachent en rien à la qualité du travail	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
Méthodes bien expliquées	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
Il n'y a aucune ambiguïté dans les resultats. Néanmoins certains points sont à étoffés.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
Tout est bien mené. Il y a une conformité entre le resumé et la conclusion et le contenu de l'article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
Les références sont appropriées. Cependant, certains auteurs de la référence bibliographique ne sont pas cités dans le contenu de l'article. Il faut le revoir.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	*
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Aderewa Amontcha

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.
Completed: 2022-10-29 02:49 AM
Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- (•) 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*Le titre mis ne couvre pas tous les aspects développés dans le document

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
***Certains résultats présentés dans le résumé manquent de précision**

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

Quelques défauts ont été soulignés dans la formulation de certaines idées

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

***La méthodologie de recherche décrite ne ressort pas les critères de choix des enquêtés.**
L'important outil d'évaluation des impacts (grille de fecteau) annoncé comme étant utilisé n'a pas été présenté pour permettre à tous les lecteurs de comprendre l'appréciation des impacts

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

***Dans la partie résulta, des aspects non couverts par le titre du manuscrit, puis une population d'enquêtés non présenté dans la démarche méthodologique sont apparus. Par ailleurs, l'appréciation de la persistance de certains impacts est erronée. Ce n'est pas parce que les auteurs des dégâts causées n'entreprennent aucune action de restauration que ceux-ci sont irréversibles**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

***Oui**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

***Oui, mais la présentation doit être harmonisée**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Relecture complète de manuscrit pour prendre en compte les observations et suggestions (entre autres : harmoniser le titre avec le contenu du document; préciser les critères de choix des enquêtés; compléter la grille de fecteau à la démarche méthodologique; revoir l'appréciation de la persistance des impacts; etc.).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer Files

Kouakou Gains K. KPAN

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.
Completed: 2022-10-26 08:29 PM
Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- (•) 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

***I think the title should be changed to be consistent with the article's content. Indeed, the impacts highlighted in work do not only concern the physical or abiotic component of ecosystems. The author has also talked about the biotic part of ecosystems (plants, animals, and humans). Therefore, I propose the following title: IMPACT DE L'ORPAILLAGE SUR DES ECOSYSTEMES FORESTIERS DU SECTEUR DE SOUANKE, REPUBLIQUE DU CONGO**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

***The abstract clearly presents the objective, methods, and results. However, references of spectrophotometry should be provided to make the abstract more glowing.**

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

There are grammatical errors in the article. However, these errors do not greatly mar the work. The author may find these errors in the revised version of the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

***Except for the determination of water turbidity, which needs to be clarified and referenced, the other methods are quite clear. The author should therefore clarify the method for determining water turbidity**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

***The body of the text is clear but, it contains some errors. I mentioned these errors directly in the text. the author must consider these errors and correct them.**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*****The conclusion is in adequation with the title et objectives. however, the last paragraph of the conclusion should be reorganized as I indicated in the manusript.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
***Some of the references listed by the author were cited in the text. I recommend that the author correct these shortcomings**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ◉ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ◉ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ◉ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest that the author takes into account the contributions and criticisms made to this work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I will be happy to be the reviewer of other manuscripts