

Paper: “Traditions, Tabous et Conservation de la Biodiversité dans le Complexe Bobaomby, Extrême Nord de Madagascar”

Submitted: 14 March 2023

Accepted: 29 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Jeanneney Rabearivony

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p201

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tanomehsoumylène Ella
Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Abidjan, Côte-d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Fernando Paulo Oliveira Magalhães
Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 03/04/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/04/2023
Manuscript Title: Traditions and taboos in Bobaomby Complex, northern Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0337/23	
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: No	
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.	2
The title contains irregularities related to the writing. Sometimes the first letters are uppercase sometimes some first letters are lowercase. The title must be written in regular type (lowercase), except for the first letter of the title and the names. The term "complex" is pejoratively mentioned in the title, it is not conventional, is it a region? From a locality, from a forest reserve? Example of reformulation of the	

subject: "Ethnographic approach to cultural taboos in the Boboamby forest reserve in the far north of Madagascar".	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The writing process is descriptive. It does not take into account the methodological and theoretical process of the authors.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The text contains syntactical and grammatical errors. In the introduction the word "tel" is often misused. Indeed, "such" agrees in gender and number with the noun that follows then, "such Baobab" should not be written. As well as many others! Excessively long sentences interfere with the understanding of the text, for example: "Most of the studies undertaken in Madagascar...very few investigations have taken place there (Golden and Comaroff, 2015a; Osterhoudt, 2018)". This sentence is seven lines in the introduction. There are others in the body of the text.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The work does not rest on an obvious methodological foundation. The authors do not stipulate the methodological order used in this work. Is it a qualitative or quantitative methodology? In addition, the sampling approach is biased. The authors claim to conduct interviews and interviews. Such a consequence is only the work of a qualitative approach. Moreover, there is no verbatim justifying the transcription of the respondents' comments.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results contain errors of various forms. First, the title of the figures and tables must be written above the different representations. Then, sources must appear below each representation. (Source, our surveys, date...) The discussion is not linked to a Theoretical framework of analysis. She teaches herself an explanation of survey data. The discussion is the confrontation of the survey data in order to bring out the underlying interpretations with the theoretical lighting. The acknowledgment section should be removed from the body of the text. It does not correspond to this type of exercise. It is imperative to replace it with the conclusion.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	0
The work has no conclusions.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The bibliography contains irregularities related to the writing of the authors' names and punctuations of various kinds. The quotation marks are badly represented as well as the tabulation. This type of inaccuracy is often linked to copying and pasting texts. The bibliography is abundant and does not exhaustively reflect the references of the text.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Authors must irremediably follow the recommendations suggested in the evaluation grid. This type of exercise must necessarily be housed in a theoretical and methodological framework. The conclusion is essential to scientific writing.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is a mine of information which must be scientifically well elaborated.

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 KOFFI N'Dri Célestin	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire Chercheur Libéral	
Date Manuscript Received: 28-03-23	Date Review Report Submitted: 05-04-23
Manuscript Title: Traditions et tabous dans le Complexe Bobaomby, extrême Nord de Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0337/23	
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	

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 clair</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le résumé ne présente pas clairement les outils et les résultats, et n'a pas pris en compte les objectifs	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Cette partie n'explique pas clairement la méthodologie	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats ne sont pas clairement analysés	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il n'y a pas de conclusion	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les références sont beaucoup vieilles	

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):

Les résultats à analyser sont déjà dans la discussion, il faut les disposer convenablement. Il faut utiliser les références un peu plus récentes (à partir de 2010 et plus)

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:	
University/Country: Institut National de la Jeunesse et des Sports Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: Date de reception du manuscript: 24 Mars 2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Traditions et Tabous dans le Complexe Bobaomby, extrême Nord de Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0337 /2023	
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.	3

<i>Il permet de comprendre les valeurs culturelles d'une communauté, y compris les stratégies endogènes initiées par ces communautés afin de préserver leur environnement</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Le résumé est explicite mais ne met pas en évidence l'objectif de l'étude et la question à laquelle elle répond. Les méthodes et les résultats ne sont pas clairement présentés</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Il y a des coquilles à corriger et des phrases à revoir</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>Vous avez illustré les méthodes utilisées pour la collecte des données, l'échantillon n'a pas été définis</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats devraient être bien structurés en se référant aux objectifs spécifiques de votre étude</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>La conclusion n'a pas été présenté dans le document</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>Les références sont bien présentées, mais certaines références ne sont pas complètes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: