EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute ESI
10 YEARS

Paper: **"Effect of Pinus halepensis Mill. Reforestation on the AboveGround Biomass and Internode Elongation and Leaf Size of Native Species in Morroco"**

Submitted: 15 June 2024
Accepted: 28 August 2024
Published: 31 August 2024

Corresponding Author: Khalid Benarchid

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n24p192

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Carlos Alberto
Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Brazil

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Valeria Santa
Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto, Argentina

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: Valeria Santa	
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto - Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 29-07-2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **Effect of Pinus halepensis Mill. reforestation on the above-ground biomass and internode elongation and leaf size of native species in Morroco**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 62.06.2024	
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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is clear and correctly expresses the content of the article	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**5**
The abstract is complete, expresses objects, methods, and results	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**3**
Figure 1 has no legend. *Data labels in Figures 4, 5 and 6 overlap and cannot be read.*	

In Figure 2, references should indicate treatment type only (should not say "series 1, series 2, etc.). *The horizontal axis of the figures does not have a legend.* *Some scientific names are not written in italics*	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methodology is well explained and the procedures are understood	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The results are clear, but there are errors in the text (e.g. scientific names that are not written in italics)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions are adequate, they adjust to the development of the work	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest reviewing the full text, some suggestions are marked in the text but others are not.