

Paper: “Étude Comparative des Effets des Feux de Brousse dans les Parcs Nationaux de Mikea et de Zombitse-Vohibasia a Madagascar”

Submitted: 28 September 2023

Accepted: 05 November 2023

Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Felicitée Rejo-Fienena

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n33p262

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Patrice Trekpo
Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 2: N'golo Bamba
Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts, Docteur en Sciences de la Nature, Spécialité Foresterie

Reviewer 3: Ousmane Ndiaye
Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar, Senegal

Reviewer 4: Tahiana Andriaharimalala
Centre National de la Recherche sur l'Environnement (CNRE)

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Oui mais il faudra remplacer "brousse par végétation"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Non
il faudra revoir pour avoir le schéma: contexte, objectifs, méthodologie, résultats, conclusion et recommandations

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

Oui,
Nécessaire de reformuler plusieurs phrases

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Oui mais à reformuler pour être plus précis et plus concis

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

Plus ou moins claire et avec quelques fautes

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

Plus ou moins;
A revoir

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Plusieurs références no, cités dans le manuscrit; le rapport des évaluations dont les données ont servi à élaborer des figures ne sont pas citées ici.

A revoir donc

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Revoir le contenu du manuscrit afin de le rendre plus lisible et compréhensible

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

the title is clear and adequate to the content

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

the abstract presented the different parts.

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

yes a few mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the method was well explained

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

the authors used index of biodiversity but the test should have a list of the species in the 2 compared zones.

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

les feux augmentent dans la zone Zombste tandis que qu'ils connaissent une baisse dans la zone de Mikea. les facteurs causaux varient.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

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]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

list of species should be important in the test. Les espèces les plus pyrophyles pourraient être élucidées.

Reviewer J:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Le sujet est intéressant et d'actualité dans la problématique de la conservation et de la gestion durable de la biodiversité. Cependant le titre manque de clarté et nécessite une formulation.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé est moins précis masquant ainsi sa structure. Je souhaite que l'objectif général soit bien mis en exergue.
Les auteurs peuvent ressortir en fin du résumé une ou des applications des résultats obtenus.

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

Le texte est rédigé avec moins de fautes grammaticales et d'orthographe.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie n'est pas clairement expliquée. Elle ne permet une reproduction des faits.
Les paramètres étudiés ne sont pas clairement définis.

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

Le corps du manuscrit contient peu de fautes. Cependant, son style n'est pas simple et donc confus.

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

La conclusion n'est bien rendue. Elle s'apparente à une discussion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

La référence bibliographique doit être réorganisée et harmonisée : abréviation ou non des noms de revues, volume et pagination, italique ou non des noms de revues, année entre parenthèses ou non ...

Certains auteurs sont mal cités dans le texte (voir manuscrit)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le thème abordé est très important. Le manuscrit peut être publié après la prise en compte de nos observations et suggestions.

Reviewer K:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

LES FEUX DE BROUSSE, COMPARAISONS ENTRE LA FORET DES MIKEA
ET LA ZONE SAVANICOLE DU DISTRICT DE SAKARAH, MADAGASCAR.
Enlever le "DANS" dans le titre

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

OK

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

I didn't see some grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I can accept the methodology that the author used

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

Yes. But it's better to put the interpretation before the graph and figure

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

The conclusion is too short

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

OK!

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is a good one and show the reality in the field but you need to put more details on the methodology.

The conclusion is too short! What is your perspective and how do you waht to continue this research?
