



Paper: “Caractérisation géomorphologique, floristique et structurale de la forêt communautaire d’Aliyamounou à Kankan en Guinée”

Submitted: 29 November 2024

Accepted: 18 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Fodé Salifou Soumah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p57

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amani Dauphner
Université Félix Houphouët Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Sanogo Souleymane
Université Nazi BONI, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Yao Kouassi Anderson
Université Félix Houphouët Boigny, Côte d’Ivoire

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. AMANI Dauphner	
University/Country: Côte d'ivoire UFHB	
Date Manuscript Received: 20 Août 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 Aout 2024
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation géomorphologique, floristique et structurale de la forêt communautaire d'Aliyamounou à Kankan en Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 1231/24	
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:	

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
<i>PARFAIT</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>OK</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>PARFAIT</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>BIEN</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>PAS D'AMBIGUITE</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>PARFAIT</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>PASSABLE</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

PAS DE COMMENTAIRE

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: Souleymane SANOGO	
University/Country: Université Nazi BONI / Burkina Faso	
Date Manuscript Received: 13/01/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation géomorphologique, floristique et structurale de la forêt communautaire d'Aliyamounou à Kankan en Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1231/24	
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.

<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>(The title is clear)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3

<i>(The abstract is quite clear)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(There are indeed some mistakes that I found on the manuscript)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(There are methods they need to clarify, such as the evaluation of natural regeneration)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(The results are satisfactory in relation to the objectives set)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(the conclusion reflects the results obtained)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(The references are appropriate, but an effort must be made to harmonize the style.)</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):

Review the methodology and discussion

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 YAO kouassi Anderson	
University/Country: Université Félix houphouët Boigny, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation géomorphologique, floristique et structurale de la forêt communautaire d'Aliyamounou à Kankan en Guinée	
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:	
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>(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.	3
In introduction, the problem is not well posed. The author should provide more arguments that motivate me to study the area	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
The author has not shown the methodology of geomorphological	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results are poorly presented and unstructured	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

See document