

Paper: “Analyses spatiales de population de *Furcifer labordi* (Grandidier, 1872) dans la Réserve Spéciale d’Andranomena, Morondava-Madagascar”

Submitted: 08 February 2024

Accepted: 04 March 2024

Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Ahy Nirindrainiarivony

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p48

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abdou Habou M. Kamal
Université de Diffa, Niger

Reviewer 2: Konan Affoue Patricia
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Laboratoire de botanique, 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: Dr. ABDOU HABOU M. Kamal	
University/Country: Université de Diffa/Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analyse spatiale de population de Furcifer labordi dans la Reserve Spéciale d'Andranomena, Morondava-Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0237/24	
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>Le titter est bien clair, les auteurs doivent ajouter le nom de l'auteur de l'espèce étudiée</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Dans le résumé, il manqué un petit detail sur la méthodologie	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y'a moins de fautes grammaticales,	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La méthodologie est très bien détaillée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les résultats sont très bien structurés et présentés.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Un élément important est oublié dans la partie discussion, ce sont les perspectives de recherche	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Les références sont bien présentées</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):

Nous suggérons aux auteurs de prendre en considération nos observations qui pourront sans doute améliorer la qualité scientifique du manuscrit. En plus, nous recommandons une relecture de l'article afin de corriger les éventuelles coquilles.

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:12/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/02/2024
Manuscript Title: Analyse spatiale de population de <i>Furcifer labordi</i> dans la Reserve Spéciale d'Andranomena, Morondava-Madagascar	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: oui	

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> Oui, le titre est clair et il est adéquat au contenu de l'article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui,	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Peu de faut	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Méthode bien expliquée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les resultats sont bien clairs	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Oui	

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):

L'article est bien rédigé, cependant, l'auteur doit tenir compte des critiques.