

Paper: “Impacts de la Demi-lune Sylvopastorale sur la Revégétalisation des Plateaux dans le Département de Ouallam (Niger)”

Submitted: 12 September 2022

Accepted: 14 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Ousseini Moussa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p199](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p199)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lamine Ousmane

Reviewer 2: Tiokeng Bertine

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: Dr Tiokeng Bertine | |
| University/Country: Université de Dschang /Cameroun | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 28.11.2022 | Date Review Report Submitted: 03.11.2022 |
| Manuscript Title: Impacts de la demi-lune sylvopastorale sur la revégétalisation des plateaux dans le département de Ouallam (Niger) | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 81.09.2022 | |
| 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. | 4,5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le thème est d'actualité car il vise à lutter contre la désertification en restaurant les terres touchées par la désertification et la sécheresse.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le résumé est assez bien rédigé. Toutefois les auteurs devraient y ajouter une phrase présentant le contexte du travail et revoir les mots clés.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4,5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Le document est assez bien rédigé car il renferme très peu de fautes (confère document)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3,5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La méthode d'étude est acceptable, mais les auteurs peuvent faire mieux</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les résultats sont acceptables ; mais il y manque certains éléments annoncés dans la méthodologie. Certaines parties de la discussion devraient être améliorées.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3,5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>La conclusion est acceptable et ressort clairement l'intérêt du travail.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références sont bien choisies et appropriées pour la thématique.</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):

Les auteurs ont collecté des données pertinentes mais le traitement souffre encore de quelques manquements qui devraient être revus afin d'améliorer la qualité de leur manuscrit.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr Laminou M. Ousmane | |
| University/Country: Dan Dicko Dankoulodo University of Maradi - Niger | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 17/10/2022 | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Evaluation des impacts de la demi-lune sylvopastorale sur la revégétalisation des plateaux dans le département de Ouallam | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 81.09.2022 | |
| 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. | 3 |
| Le paper is not assessing impact but characterizing vegetation. So I propose the following as title : Caractéristiques de la végétation des plateaux récupérés à base de demi-lune sylvopastorale dans le département de Ouallam (Niger) | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>The writing style is poor</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 3 |
| <i>They are many but I have corrected some</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. | 4 |
| <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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: