

Paper: "Evaluation de l'Impact des Activités Anthropiques Sur la Séqustration de Carbone dans le Parc National Du Mont Sangbé, en Côte d'Ivoire"

Submitted: 04 November 2022 Accepted: 22 February 2023 Published: 28 February 2023

Corresponding Author: Tra Bi Tra Jeannot

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p367

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amani Kwassi Dauphner

Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d'Ivoire, Abidjan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

| Reviewer B: |
|------------------------------|
| Recommendation: See Comments |
| |
| |

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

The title is clear and it is in adequate to the content of the manuscript.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results. But the author needs to improve the methods

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

We have several grammatical errors in this article. The author needs to read well the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author should rewrite the methodology section with each objective. He/she should do the same for data collection and data analysis while providing specific details.

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

The author should title each part to facilitate the reading and understanding of the manuscript. Some ideas have been put forward in the discussion section that are not part of the author's research results. Figures and tables are not well annotated. The author(s) should review the structure of the document to avoid these anomalies.

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

The conclusion is clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Overall Recommendation!!!
```

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In general, an effort has been made to achieve these results. Nevertheless, we recommend that you improve the scientific quality of the document by taking into account our observations (grammatical errors, the numbering of each part, detailing a little more the methodology part, revising the annotation of the figures in the text and on the images, etc.).

Reviewer I:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

oui le titre est bon et acceptable

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

oui les methodes et les resultats sont suffisants

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

corriger les mots soulignés dans l'article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

la methodologie est bonne

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

si il y a des erreurs qu'ils devront corriger

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

la conclusion est a revoir selon les objectifs specifiques

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

acceptable

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
5
Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
4
Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
3
Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
```

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

| [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|
| 3 |
| |
| Overall Recommendation!!! |
| Accepted, minor revision needed |
| |
| Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): |
| RAS |
| |