

Paper: "Impact de la restauration des zones dégradées sur la diversité floristique de la forêt classée d'Agbo 2 (Centre-Est de la Côte d'Ivoire)"

Submitted: 09 April 2024 Accepted: 04 May 2024 Published: 31 May 2024

Corresponding Author: Youssouf Koné

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n15p200

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Djaha Kouame Université Jean Lorougnon Guede, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Kaka Kiari Boukar Kéllou Université de Diffa, Niger

Reviewer 3: Abdou Habou M. Kamal University of Diffa, Niger

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. 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: KOUAME DJAHA		
University/Country: Université Jean LOROUGNON GUEDE / Côte d'Ivoire		
Date Manuscript Received: 18/04/2024 Date Review Report Submitted: 23/04/2024		
Manuscript Title: Impact de la restauration des zones dégradées sur la diversité floristique de la forêt classée d'Agbo 2 en Côte d'Ivoire		
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0452 /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 i	n 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]	
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4	

Le titre est compréhensible, seulement il faut situer géographiquement d'Ivoire (nord, sud, est ouest, nord-est, Centre-est, etc.)	FC Agbo 2 en Côte	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4	
Le résumé présente ces trois éléments, quelques petites reformulations ont été apportées dans le document.		
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3	
Il y a effectivement quelques erreurs grammaticales et fautes d'orthographes dans le document mais d'importance mineure		
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3,5	
Une des méthodes utilisées n'a pas été expliquée dans la partie méthodologie, il faut le faire. Les autres méthodes sont adaptées.		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,5	
Les résultats sont bien présentés mais quelques petites erreurs subsistent, les commentaires sont dans le document		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
La conclusion relate les différents points étudiés		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
Les références sont appropriées pour l'étude menée		

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Quelques pétites erreurs subsistent dans le document, nous demandons aux auteurs de prendre en comptes les observations faites dans le document pour le parfaire au mieux.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. 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: KAKA KIARI Boukar Kéllou	
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/04/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/04/2024
Manuscript Title: Impact de la restaurat floristique de la forêt classée d'Agbo	ion des zones dégradées sur la diversité 2 en Côte d'Ivoire
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0452/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the autho	r of the paper: YES
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper:	s paper, is available in the "review history" of the
You approve, this review report is available in	n the "review history" of the paper:

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. 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 Maman Kamal		
University/Country: University of Diffa/Niger		
Date Manuscript Received: 24/04/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/04/2024	
Manuscript Title: Impact de la restauration des zones de classée d'Agbo 2 en Côte d'Ivoire	gradées sur la diversité floristique de la forêt	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0452/24		
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:		
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.

	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
Le titre est très imformatif	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
Le résumé donne des informations de toutes les parties de l'article	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Les règles de grammaire bien respecté	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(Please insert your comments)	
La méthodologie utilisée dans cette etude a été claire et précise.	
L'auteur a fait l'effort d'une recherché bibliographique importance	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Les donnée recoltées dans cette etude ont été bien répresentées.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
Toutes références citées dans le corps se retrouvent dans la partie références	,

${\bf Overall\ Recommendation\ (mark\ an\ X\ with\ your\ recommendation):}$

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	