

Paper: “Caractérisation des Parcs Agroforestiers à Anarcadium occidentale L. et Services Ecosystémiques dans la Forêt Classée de Dindéresso à l’Ouest du Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 28 August 2023

Accepted: 28 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Moïse Yoni

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p203](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n27p203)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Moundounga Mavouroulou
IRET, Gabon

Reviewer 3: Konan Affoue Patricia
Université NANGUI ABROGOUA, Côte d’Ivoire

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: 03/09/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/09/2023
Manuscript Title: Importance des services écosystémiques, et caractérisation des parcs agroforestiers à <i>Anarcadium occidentale</i> L. dans la Forêt Classée de Dindéresso à l'Ouest du Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02—21.09.2023	
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
<i>Le titre est clair et correspond au contenu de l'article, mais il peut être amélioré</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Les résultats sont très intéressants, mais je suggère de réorganiser la dernière partie</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est très claire et elle est bien structurée. Le début du résumé ainsi que le dernier paragraphe est à revoir</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>La police nécessite d'être harmonisée partout</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):

Prendre en compte toutes les remarques pour améliorer la qualité du manuscrit, particulièrement la partie résultat.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: