

Paper: “La Perte de Savoirs et de Pratiques Endogenes: Risques pour l’Environnement Naturel du Territoire Blouf en Basse Casamance (Senegal)”

Submitted: 29 October 2022

Accepted: 18 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Claudette Diatta

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p113](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p113)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aristide Yemmafouo
University of Dschang, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Oumar Coulibaly
University of Social Sciences and Management of Bamako, Mali

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: YEMMAFOUO Aristide	
University/Country: Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 31/01/2023
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 24-43-11-2022	
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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Just few modifications in the form are proposed	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Some elements can be improved in the form, particularly English version	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
One (re)lecture is need	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, but, some elements must be precise, as authors choosed qualitative approach	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes	

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):

This is a good paper. Authors just need to address minor revision requested along the text. This is a crucial issue in African society linking to natural milieu conservation. Indigenous knowledge and practices are indeed to be consider within the conservation program.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: January 24	Date Review Report Submitted: January,31,2023
Manuscript Title: LA PERTE DES SAVOIRS ET PRATIQUES ENDOGENES : RISQUES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT NATUREL DU TERRITOIRE BLOUF EN BASSE CASAMANCE (SENEGAL)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1148/22	
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.	5
<i>Le titre est en adéquation avec le contenu du document</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2

<i>Le titre du résumé en Anglais doit être placé au-dessus du texte</i> <i>Le résumé doit être amélioré en présentant clairement l'objectif de l'étude et les résultats.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Prendre le soin de bien relire le texte pour corriger les coquilles.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Il Faudra bien expliquer la formule utilisée dans la méthodologie avec une légende claire. Les raisons qui ont prévalu au choix des 1/5 des ménages et la source de la formule choisie. Il faudra aussi préciser le nombre de personne retenues par focus groupes et comment les données collectées ont été traitées.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Les résultats ont besoin d'être bien illustrés avec des images.</i> <i>Des petites incorrections à revoir.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est en adéquation avec le contenu du travail. Il faudra juste éviter les citations en conclusion.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Des efforts doivent être faits dans le cadre de l'harmonisation des références bibliographiques en respectant la norme ESJ.</i>	

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):

Un sujet très intéressant conduit avec une grande curiosité scientifique avec beaucoup d'informations mettant en valeur les savoirs traditionnels dans la conservation de l'environnement. L'insertion d'images pourra améliorer la qualité du travail.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Merci pour la confiance.