



Paper: “Désacralisation des forêts et altération des ressources thérapeutiques et du bien-être des populations dans le massif forestier de Deng Deng (Est-Cameroun)”

Submitted: 07 March 2023

Accepted: 14 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Kenne Djuatio William Carter

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n17p161

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Konan Koffi

Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé (UJLoG) Dalao, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Tanomehsoumylène Ella

Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Abidjan, Côte-d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: 14-05-2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Désacralisation des forêts et altération des ressources thérapeutiques et du bien-être des populations dans le massif forestier de Deng Deng (Est-Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0564/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>Le titre est bien formulé</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>Le résumé est également bien présenté</i>	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>Oui, il y a des fautes mineures à corriger</i>	3
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>Les méthodes ont été bien illustré</i>	3
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. <i>Oui , les resultats ont été structure en plusieurs points, il appartient aux auteurs de l'article de mettre en italique les propos des enquêtés</i>	3
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3

<i>Elle est bien illustré</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Mentionnez les références bibliographiques</i>	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: KONAN KOFFI	
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé (UJLoG) Dalao / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 mai 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 21 mai 2025
Manuscript Title: Désacralisation des forêts et altération des ressources thérapeutiques et du bien-être des populations dans le massif forestier de Deng Deng (Est-Cameroun)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64.05.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui	

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
(Please insert your comments)	

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
Votre résumé ne mentionne pas la technique d'échantillonnage, ni le nombre de personnes interrogées et leur statut social, ni les techniques, ni les outils de collecte des données. Il est à revoir. Votre résumé ne mentionne non plus le problème de l'étude.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Moins de fautes dans le texte	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
A partir d'un tableau, veuillez faire le récapitulatif des acteurs interrogés par village, par statut social, etc. Précisez le nombre de chaque groupe d'acteur. Au nombre de combien ? Chaque entretien de groupe était composé de combien de personnes ?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
L'auteur doit revoir la numérotation selon le plan suivant: Introduction; 1. Méthodologie 2. Résultat 3. Discussion Conclusion	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

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):

L'auteur doit aérer le texte afin de faciliter la lecture.