

Paper: “Diversité des Épiphytes Vasculaires de la Forêt Secondaire de Koubola (Département du Pool, District de Goma Tsé-Tsé) et de la Forêt du Parc Zoologique de Brazzaville, République du Congo”

Submitted: 19 May 2022

Accepted: 23 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Saint Fedriche Ndzai

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p240](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p240)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maximenne Amontcha

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Souleymane SANOGO, Université Nazi BONI / Burkina Faso

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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:	
Date Manuscript Received:02/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Diversité des épiphytes vasculaires de la forêt secondaire de Koubola (Département du Pool, district de Goma Tsé-Tsé) et de la forêt du Parc Zoologique de Brazzaville, République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Absence, de precision de la periode et zone d'étude</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Phrases longues, souvent difficiles à comprendre</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<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:

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: Adéréwa AMONTCHA YABI	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC) / Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/05/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Diversité des épiphytes vasculaires de la forêt secondaire de Koubola (Département du Pool, district de Goma Tsé-Tsé) et de la forêt du Parc Zoologique de Brazzaville, République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.05.2022	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a quelques problèmes de formulation à y régler	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a de l'incohérence dans l'agencement de nombreuses idées Des mots en trop ou des mots manquants ont également été remarqués	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Certaines approches sont mal libellées Le protocole statistique de la diversité de Shannon est erroné Les méthodes d'analyse des résultats des différent calculs faits n'ont pas été présentées	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Des aspects non développés dans la partie résultat sont apparus, sans que ça ne soit des perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<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:

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: Souleymane SANOGO	
University/Country: Université Nazi BONI / Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 02/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Diversité des épiphytes vasculaires de la forêt secondaire de Koubola (Département du Pool, district de Goma Tsé-Tsé) et de la forêt du Parc Zoologique de Brazzaville, République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0558/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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>The title can be reduced</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The subject study was not well introduced</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are mistakes that could be avoided</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>No problem with the sampling method</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are in accordance with the method</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>They could add some numerical results to the conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>ok for the references with some minimal mistakes</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):

Reread the manuscript very well before submission, as there are mistakes that could be avoided

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: