



Paper: “Diversité et Modes de Dissémination des diaspores du Peuplement Végétal de la Commune de Cocody (Abidjan-Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 18 September 2025

Accepted: 03 December 2025

Published: 31 December 2025

Corresponding Author: Achi Seka Pierre Davy

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n36p169

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adéréwa A. M. Amontcha
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: Silue Pagadjovongo Adama
Peleforo GON COULIBALY University, Cote d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Adéréwa A. M. AMONTCHA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin)	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/11/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2025
Manuscript Title: Diversité et Mode de Dissémination des diapoires du Peuplement Végétal de la Commune de Cocody (Abidjan-Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 18.10.2025	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Please insert your comments)	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) Les principales approches de traitement des données et d'analyse des résultats ne ressortent pas dans le résumé	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Please insert your comments) Quelques problèmes de formulation sont soulignés dans le manuscrit	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
L'approche de détermination des « types biologiques, morphologiques et chorologiques » n'est pas présentée dans le manuscrit	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Certains chiffres posent problèmes. Bien vouloir revoir les chiffres ou la formulation des idées pour qu'il y ait cohérence entre eux.	
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	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Tenir compte des observations et propositions pour améliorer le manuscrit.

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: 08 octobre 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 novembre 2025
Manuscript Title: Diversité et Mode de Dissémination des diapoires du Peuplement Végétal de la Commune de Cocody (Abidjan-Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10.10.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Non	
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: 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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
<i>Reformuler l'objectif et étoffer la méthodologie</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Mineurs</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Etoffer certaines parties de la méthodologie</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Ajouter des illustration notamment au niveau du titre 1 des résultats</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Étoffer le résumé avec les résultats pertinents</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Rediger les références selon le modèle de la revue</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):

Faire interpretation objective des résultats dans la discussion
Rédiger l'article suivant les instructions du guide des auteurs de la revue

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: