

Paper: “Conflit Autour d’Un Espace Protégé : Cas du Parc National de Basse Casamance”

Submitted: 15 November 2022

Accepted: 20 February 2023

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: Abdourahmane Mbade Sène

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n5p36](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n5p36)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Touple Sbiri Koné
Felix Houphouet-Boigny University, Ivory Coast

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 KONE Touplé Sibiri	Email:
University/Country: FELIX HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY UNIVERSITY, IVORY COAST	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Conflict around a protected area: case of the Basse Casamance National Park	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
the title is correct.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The summary is well done. However, the problem and the objectives of the study do not appear clearly in the text.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are very few grammatical and spelling errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
Each result should have a clear methodology that can be replicated by a novice scientist. It should also include the items you investigated. It will be necessary to give the reasons for the basis of the 12% of the population as a sample.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear and well written. The caption for Figure 2 should be placed after the image.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
references are appropriate.	

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):

You should take into account the observations made in the manuscript and incorporate them as much as possible.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: