

Paper: “Local Practices in Sacred Groves Management in Togo: A Comparative Study in Nawda, Ifè, and Ouatchi Lands”

Submitted: 08 March 2024

Accepted: 25 May 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Akouété Galé Ekoue

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n14p40](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n14p40)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Namla Djadjiti
Environmental Biology, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Nat Quansah
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is clear and adequate for the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents the aim, methods, and results.

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

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article (see attached file for corrections).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explicitly explained.

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

There are some errors in sentence structure and grammar, but they do not hinder comprehension of the content of the body of the present paper. See the attached file for corrections to enhance the overall coherence and readability of the paper (this comment applies to the entire manuscript).

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

The content of the manuscript aligns with the conclusion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are some inconsistencies in the list of references, especially in the interviews (lack of year and authors). Review your citations to make sure each in-text citation has been included in the list of references and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the attached file for comments.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title fits the content of the article. It is clear and concise.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well presented. It is complete in its representation of the research that has been done.

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

Hardly any grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. The very few that are present have been highlighted and corrected in red to the attention of the corresponding author.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Clear and concise, well explained methods, including presenting of the study sites

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

The article is well written and presented making it easy to read and understand. The very few errors have been highlighted and presented in red for the attention of the corresponding author

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

The conclusion depicts the article. It is an accurate summary of and fits what the paper is about.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are complete: all in-text citations are present in the reference section and vice versa.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Well researched and written paper. Please, check and streamline the very few corrections that I've indicated. Well done!
