

Paper: “Préservation et Gestion Durable de la Zone Humide de Bagné : Analyse des Enjeux, Menaces et Défis Pour la Conservation de l'Ecosystème”

Submitted: 20 October 2023

Accepted: 23 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Aïcha Tapsoba

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p148](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n36p148)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saturnin Degnon
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Kpan Gains
Laboratoire Central (LCAE), 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!

Reviewer Name: DEGNON Saturnin	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 06.11.2023
Manuscript Title: Préservation et gestion durable de la zone humide de Bagré : analyse des enjeux, menaces et défis pour la conservation de l'écosystème	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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

Le titre est bien formulé et clair	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Faire aussi le résumé en français	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Peu de fautes de grammaire dans l'article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
il faut ressortir dans les résultats les menaces sur l'environnement comme sous titre car pour préserver et gérer de façon durable la zone humide il faut analyser les impacts environnementaux des activités menées sur cette zone.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Se conformer à la présentation des références de ESJ et s'assurer que toutes les auteurs cités sont dans la référence	

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):

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:15/11/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Preservation and sustainable management of the Bagré wetland: analysis of issues, threats, and challenges for ecosystem conservation	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1109/23	
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: 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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

The authors must take into account the comments I made in the text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript was well written. The authors have taken their work seriously enough.