

Paper: “Etat des Lieux des Incertitudes Liées à l’Estimation de la Biomasse des Arbres (Revue Bibliographique)”

Submitted: 11 October 2022

Accepted: 20 February 2022

Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: Moundounga Mavouroulou Quentin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p60](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p60)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Alhassane Zare

University Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: 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!

Date Manuscript Received: 20 December 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 December 2022
Manuscript Title: Estimation de la biomasse des arbres et incertitudes associées (Revue bibliographique)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1090/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title of the article would be more relevant if it was rephrased as follows: Etat des lieux des incertitudes liées à l'estimation de la biomasse des arbres.	

This title reflects better the aim of this study mentioned in the abstract and in the content and the conclusions presented	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract sums up the work done but did not take into account the method. It maybe because of the editorial style of this kind of article (objective, results, conclusion)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Very few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes were found in the article. This shows the authors proof read their paper prior to submission. They just need to make the necessary corrections	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the methods are not clearly presented in the abstract, it is perhaps the editorial style of this kind of article (objective, results, conclusion)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Results are clear but authors can highlight incertitude (%) of each method instead of focusing on difficulties of some methods. Exemple of : Mesure par méthode géométrique.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> References are comprehensive and appropriate; however, there's one (01) reference cited in the text (488) whose date is placed between paratheses. Need to harmonize.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

You've done a great job. This work allows to consider the uncertainties linked to biomass measurements in order to highlight the real value of carbon stocks sequestered by trees or forests. Just make the indicated corrections to make your paper complete. Well done!