

Paper: “Variation de la Durée de Vie de Furcifer labordi en Fonction de Certains Facteurs dans la Réserve Spéciale d’Andranomena, Morondava, Madagascar”

Submitted: 12 June 2023

Accepted: 29 July 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Ahy Nirindrainiarivony

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n21p231](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n21p231)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saint Guillaume Odoukpe
Felix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY University, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Abissa Antoine Yao
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: ODOUKPE K. Saint Guillaume	
University/Country: Felix HOUPHOUET-BOIGNY University (Côte d'Ivoire).	
Date Manuscript Received: June 30	Date Review Report Submitted: July 07
Manuscript Title: Variation longitudinale de longévité de <i>Furcifer labordi</i> et analyse de facteurs à l'origine de sa longue durée de vie dans la Réserve Spéciale d'Andranomena-Morondava, Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0655-23	
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	
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>The title is clear but the Longitudinal longevity variation is not perceptible in the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The authors must include the methodology and the study period.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been corrected directly in the manuscript.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The study methods did not explain clearly. Comments have been made directly in the manuscript.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are clear but contain a few errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes</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):

The authors must revise the methods in particular bird inventory. All observations are included in the manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 01/06/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/07/2023
Manuscript Title: Variation longitudinale de longévité de <i>Furcifer labordi</i> et analyse de facteurs à l'origine de sa longue durée de vie dans la Réserve Spéciale d'Andranomena-Morondava, Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0655/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/ No	

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
Le titre n'est pas en adéquation avec le contenu du document à cause du mot "longitudinal". En effet, ni dans la méthodologie, ni dans les résultats encore	

moins dans la discussion et la conclusion, ce mot n'est apparu, ou du moins, n'est perceptible.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Le est relativement bien présenté. Cependant il contredit le titre en parlant de variation latitudinale	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Très peu de fautes grammaticales.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
La méthodologie est bien expliquée, sauf que je la trouve incomplète. Il me semble que avez utilisé le test de Kruskal-Wallis pour des analyses mais les données de traitements statistiques qui vous ont permis de tirer des conclusions sont ce que l'on voit dans le cas de test de khi-deux. Je le dis à cause du symbole χ^2	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Les résultats sont bien rendus mais ils ne traduisent pas clairement le titre. Soit il faut corriger le titre, soit il faut revoir le contenu pour qu'il y ait harmonie.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
La conclusion, le résumé et le contenu n'expliquent pas le titre	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Rien à signaler	

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):

Votre travail est bon dans la forme mais il y a un problème de fond.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The document is good in the form but it poses a substantive problem because of the title. The authors must either correct the title or the content to harmonize.