



**Paper: “Etat des lieux des initiatives privées de conservation ex situ de la flore ligneuse du Sénégal”**

**Submitted: 11 November 2025**

**Accepted: 25 December 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Ibrahima Pène

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n36p113

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yapo Yomah Cynthia Viviane  
Alassane OUATTARA University (Bouaké), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Koudegnan Comlan Mawussi  
Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 3: Sylla Youssouf  
Université Nangui ABROGOUA, 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!***

Reviewer Name: YAPO Yomeh Cynthia Viviane	
University/Country: Alassane OUATTARA University (Bouaké) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/12/2025
Manuscript Title: Etat des lieux des initiatives privées de conservation ex situ de la flore ligneuse du Sénégal  Overview of private initiatives for the <i>ex situ</i> conservation of woody plants in Senegal	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.11.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui/ Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui/ Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui/ 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.

<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>4</b>
<p><i>Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i></p> <p><i>Clarity: readers immediately understand the subject (here: conservation initiatives, ex situ, Senegal). Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p><i>Specificity: it avoids being too broad, pointing precisely to the flora woody and the geographic context.</i></p>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>Relevance: it corresponds to the methodology and results discussed in the paper.</i></p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<p><i>Yes, just a few small errors, but otherwise it's fine</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>Yes, the methods in your study are indeed explained with clarity. They outline:</i></p> <p><i>Approach: an exhaustive inventory of ligneous species across all sectors of the site.</i></p> <p><i>Procedure: systematic prospection in multiple directions until no new species are found without considerable effort.</i></p> <p><i>Identification: use of authoritative floras (Hutchinson &amp; Dalziel, Berhaut) and standardized nomenclature (Lebrun &amp; Stork).</i></p> <p><i>Classification : application of Raunkiaer's system, adapted to tropical conditions, distinguishing six biological forms (Phanérophytes, Chaméphytes, Hémicryptophytes, Géophytes, Thérophytes, Parasites).</i></p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>It's clear and do not contain errors. (Please insert your comments)</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4,5</b>

*Your conclusions are clear, precise and well supported by the content of the study. They accurately reflect:*

- *Quantitative data (358 species, 271 genera, 76 families) that reinforce scientific validity.*
- *Qualitative observations (predominance of Fabaceae, floristic heterogeneity, ecological complementarity) that give meaning to the results.*
- *The strategic scope (role of private conservatories in a national network, synergies between ex situ and in situ) that links the results to conservation issues.*
- *The international dimension (commitments to biodiversity and climate adaptation) that broadens the relevance of your conclusions.*

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

**4,5**

*Yes, the references are indeed comprehensive and appropriate. They cover:*

- *Foundational works on floristic inventories and classification (Raunkiaer, Trochain, Lebrun & Stork).*
- *Regional floras essential for species identification (Hutchinson & Dalziel, Berhaut).*
- *Methodological sources on inventory techniques (Maillet, Le Bourgeois).*
- *Contextual reports from institutions (MEPN, ANSD, UNESCO) that situate the study within Senegal's biodiversity and administrative framework.*
- *Recent scientific studies confirming the role of private ex situ conservatories in biodiversity conservation. (Please insert your comments)*

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

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

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

**The authors come from the same university (not recommended) and different laboratories (recommended).**

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

No comment! Thank you!

# 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: <b>KOUDEGNAN Comlan Mawussi</b>	
University/Country: <b>Université de Lomé, Togo</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>03 – 12 - 2025</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>12 – 12 – 2025</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Etat des lieux des initiatives privées de conservation ex situ de la flore ligneuse du Sénégal</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1158/25</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>En s'appuyant sur le contenu du manuscrit, la formulation du titre peut être gardée telle quelle. Car, les techniques de sauvegarde et de conservation des espèces découlent des idées avancées par soit des organisations non gouvernementales ou des organisations paysannes organisées, ...</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Le résumé présenté par l'auteur ressort globalement les grandes lignes de ce manuscrit. Il contient une introduction, l'objectif de cette étude, la méthode utilisée, les principaux résultats obtenus et une conclusion qui a répondu à la preoccupation de l'auteur.</b>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Il y a quelques fautes que l'auteur doit corriger. Revoir la formulation de certaines phrases, l'emploi de certains verbes ou mots, ...</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Méthodes acceptables</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>L'auteur a essayé de presenter ses résultats obtenus.</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>Acceptable</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Au total, l'auteur a présenté 29 références dont Presque les 75% sont publiées avant l'année 2010. Il s'en suit alors que les références choisies par l'auteur sont largement très vieilles de plus de 25%.</b> <b>Ce dernier est tenu de compléter son manuscrit par des références plus récentes et illustratives de la thématique étudiée ici.</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):**

- Il faut numéroter les pages du manuscript.
- Il faut supprimer la reprise des auteurs au niveau de la version anglaise du titre et du résumé.
- Dans la citation des auteurs, il faut mettre “al.” en italique
- Il faut éviter les phrases trop longues, complexes et lourdes à comprendre

**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: SYLLA Youssouf	
University/Country: Université Nangui ABROGOUA	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/12/2025
Manuscript Title: Etat des lieux des initiatives privées de conservation ex situ de la flore ligneuse du Sénégal	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 58.11.2025	
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]
-----------	---



<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No comment</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>No comment, but there are a few corrections I made directly in the manuscript</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes, but there are a few corrections I made directly in the manuscript</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>I observed a lack of structure in the methodology. Therefore, I have included suggestions for structuring the methodology directly in the manuscript to improve it. Methodology presentation plan: Methodology - Presentation of the study area - Floristic composition of the sites (addressing floristic richness, biological types, chorological types, and similarities between sites) - Floristic diversity of the sites</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>I also noted a lack of coherence in the presentation of the results. I have also formulated suggestions for structuring the presentation of the results directly within the logical framework of the manuscript, specifically regarding the methodology: Methodology - Distribution of conservation sites - Floristic composition of the sites (addressing floristic richness, biological types, chorological types, and similarities between sites) - Floristic diversity of the sites</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>No comment</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>I noticed some errors in the insertion of references within the text, as well as a few errors in the references in the bibliography. I also made suggestions for corrections directly in the manuscript</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):**

*This work is interesting and yields important results. The suggestions made aim to improve the presentation of these results. Regarding the suggestions for linking the methodology and results, made directly in the manuscript to improve its quality, the authors should take them into account as much as possible. The same applies to the references.*

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