



**Paper: “Contribution to the Systematic Study of the Ornamental Flora of Gorée Island (Dakar-Senegal)”**

**Submitted: 13 January 2026**

**Accepted: 21 February 2026**

**Published: 28 February 2026**

Corresponding Author: Birane Dieng

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n6p87

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paulin Ouoba  
Université Nazi Boni, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Yoka Joseph  
Université Marien Ngouabi, République du Congo

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026**

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: 06 February 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 13 February 2026
Manuscript Title: <b>Contribution to the Systematic Study of the Ornamental Flora of Gorée Island (Dakar-Senegal)</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 8 ESJ	
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: 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.**

<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>5</b>
Yes, the title is clear and appropriate for the content of the article. From the title, we already have an idea of the content of the article. As soon as we read the content, we automatically get the idea from the title.	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes, the abstract clearly presents the objective of the study, the methods and the results. This is in line with the standard outline for the abstract.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
No, we did not find any grammatical or spelling errors. The article is well written. However, authors should always proofread the article before submitting the corrected manuscript.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

Yes, the methods are clearly explained. However, a few minor corrections should be made as follows: (i) the caption for Figure 1 should be in English, as we suggested directly in the text in yellow; (ii) the equipment should not be listed as the authors have done, but should be cited in the description of the methods. We have highlighted this in yellow in the text; (iii) with regard to biological and chorological types, authors must specify that this is a raw spectrum; the weighted spectrum is not taken into account. The quality of the formulas used to calculate these spectra needs to be improved, as the equations are poorly positioned; (iv) In references, the expression et al. should be written in italics, as we have corrected in green in the text (improvement to be incorporated).	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The results are clear, but they contain a few formatting errors that the authors need to correct, as we have noted in the text. (i) The names of the authors of the scientific names of the species should not be written in italics; the authors should incorporate the improvements made in green; (ii) In Table 2 concerning the taxonomic spectrum, the authors should make improvements as highlighted in yellow. (iii) Authors must place the table number and title above each table; (iv) the figure number and title should be placed below each figure; (v) The results relating to biological types are presented in figure form and those relating to chorological types are presented in table form. Authors should standardize their presentations. It is preferable for these results to be presented in figure form, as we have suggested in yellow in the text.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
The conclusions are accurate; the main results are presented. However, the authors should specify how these results could be exploited.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes, the references are understandable and appropriate, as they are relevant to the subject matter. The authors should review these references, taking into account the journal's instructions to authors, before submitting the revised version.	

**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):**

Authors are required to make minor corrections to improve their manuscript. In the text, improvements to be made are highlighted in yellow. Corrections to be incorporated by authors are highlighted in green.

After incorporating these minor corrections and proofreading the manuscript carefully, the authors may resubmit the article for publication.

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