

Paper: “Diversité et importance socio-économique de la flore sauvage de la mare de Bougary (Assaba, Mauritanie) et ses bordures”

Submitted: 08 July 2024

Accepted: 28 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Abdellahi Mohamed Vall Hmeyada

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p162](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n30p162)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohamed Fennane
Mohamed V University in Rabat, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Djalidou Salifou
University of Parakou, Benin

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: Mohamed FENNANE	
University/Country: Mohamed V University in Rabat	
Date Manuscript Received: 2024.09.17	Date Review Report Submitted: 2024.09.21
Manuscript Title: Diversité et importance socio-économique de la flore sauvage de la mare de Bougary (Assaba, Mauritanie)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0750/24	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>very few.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Le volet “écologie” présentée dans le paragraphe “Structure spatiale de la végétation” mérite des éclaircissements: au niveau de la méthodologie comme au</i>	

niveau des résultats on ne sait pas clairement quelle est l'approche suivie par les auteurs ; autrement dit, les unités recherchées (qualifiées de type de paysage ou de formations végétales) seraient basées sur des critères physiologiques, écologiques, topographiques ...?

Enquête terrain : les auteurs ne précisent pas leur manière de faire : par questionnaire ?, nombre de personnes interrogées ... Dans le paragr. "Traitement de données" il est question de fiches brutes, que renseignent elles ?

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	?
<i>Je ne sais pas s'il y a des références récentes utiles qui n'ont pas été exploitées par les auteurs.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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