

**Paper: “Reconstitution du stock de carbone pendant la dynamique de régénération de l’Unité Forestière d’Aménagement (UFA) Tsama-Mbama en comparaison avec la forêt primaire, département de la Cuvette-Ouest (République du Congo)”**

**Submitted: 28 July 2024**

**Accepted: 20 September 2024**

**Published: 30 September 2024**

Corresponding Author: Koubouana Félix

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p165

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Joseph Yoka  
Université Marien NGOUABI, République du Congo

Reviewer 2: Abi-Kaberou Alain  
Université Nationale d’Agriculture, Benin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

### **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!***

Date Manuscript Received: <b>5 August 2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>10 August 2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Reconstitution du stock de carbone pendant la dynamique de régénération de l'Unité Forestière d'Aménagement (UFA) Tsama-Mbama, département de la Cuvette-Ouest (République du Congo)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 08-26.08.2024	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b> You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, the title is clear and appropriate for the content of the article. From the title, we already have an idea of the content of the article. As soon as we read the content, we automatically get the idea from the title.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objective of the study, the methods and the results. This is in line with the standard outline for the abstract. However, the methods need to be completed, with regard to the results presented.</b>	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>This article contains no spelling mistakes. However, we have corrected the few grammatical errors found and the authors must accept these corrections.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>study methods are clearly explained. However, a few details need to be provided, as we requested directly in the text.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, the results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, the conclusion is correct, clear and concise; it highlights the main results. It is consistent with the results contained in the article. However, it does not present the scientific and socio-economic interest of the study.</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate, because they fit in well with the subject matter.</b>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Authors are required to take into account the few minor comments made directly in the document in order to improve the quality of their article. Comments marked in red should be deleted; comments marked in green are corrections made and should be accepted; comments marked in yellow are questions asked, clarifications requested, and therefore improvements to be made.

The detailed table included in the discussion does not serve any purpose and should be returned to the appendix. If not, it should be deleted altogether, as we said in the document.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### **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: ABI-KABEROU Alain	
University/Country: Université Nationale d'Agriculture/Benin	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/08/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/08/2024
Manuscript Title: Reconstitution du stock de carbone pendant la dynamique de régénération de l'Unité Forestière d'Aménagement (UFA) Tsama-Mbama, département de la Cuvette-Ouest (République du Congo)	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	
<i>the title is clear and adapted to the context</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	
<i>Yes</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>Yes, just Check the paper</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<i>the methods are explained clearly</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<i>Good, small things to be corrected</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>Yes, Good</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>Good</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I suggest that the authors revise the discussion of the results so that we can better appreciate the contribution of this work to the advancement of science.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**