



Paper: **“Diversité et usages des plantes médicinales des forêts sacrées de la région de Kankan, Guinée”**

Submitted: 08 January 2026

Accepted: 10 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Fodé Salifou Soumah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n9p142

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edmond Sylvestre Miabangana
Herbier National du Congo (IEC), Brazzaville, République du Congo

Reviewer 2: Moyabi Any Georges Armel
Université de Bondoukou, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 3: Abdoulaye Abdou Siradji
Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 4: Blinded

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr MOYABI Any Georges Armel	
University/Country: Université de Bondoukou/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/01/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/02/2026
Manuscript Title: Diversité et usages des plantes médicinales des forêts sacrées de la région de Kankan, Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0151/26	
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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5

5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Ensure uniform formatting of bibliographic references (volume, issue, page numbers, and full journal titles)</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):

This is a very good research work. The manuscript is clear and easy to read. We hope that these comments will be taken into account. Please ensure uniform formatting of bibliographic references (volume, issue, page numbers, and full journal titles).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comment

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Edmond Sylvestre MIABANGANA	
University/Country: Herbar National du Congo (IEC), Brazzaville, République du Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 28.01.2026	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Diversité et usages des plantes médicinales des forêts sacrées de la région de Kankan, 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: 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.

<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.	5
<i>Le titre est clair, précis et concis</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	5
<i>Le résumé est bien structuré</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Juste deux fautes orthographiques glissées par inadvertance Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<i>Travail bien structuré, incluant deux méthodologies complémentaires : Etude de la flore et de la végétation d'une part et les enquêtes ethnobotaniques d'autre part</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Les résultats sont bien présentés. Quelques erreurs dans la transcription des noms botaniques sont décelées et corrigées directement dans le texte en surlignage vert. Il y a une cohérence entre l'approche taxonomique (APG IV) et les familles botaniques. Les auteurs peuvent toutefois consulter le référentiel taxonomique de Lebrun et Stork (https://www.ville-ge.ch/musinfo/bd/cjb/africa/recherche.php?langue=fr) pour d'éventuels changements tels <i>Sarcocephalus latifolius</i>, (= <i>Nauclea latifolia</i>)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>La conclusion est bien soutenue par la discussion. A mon humble avis et sans caractère d'obligation, les plantes médicinales qui ont présenté des résultats probants (revue scientifique) sur les plans chimique et pharmacologique auraient permis aux auteurs de mettre en lumière l'évidence ethnomédicale si l'expertise scientifique corroborait les usages traditionnelles.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Il y a concordance entre les auteurs cités dans la corpus du texte et les références bibliographiques. Cependant les auteurs ont omis par moment de les présenter par ordre alphabétique Ex : la référence 8 (Bagnian et al. 2008) doit venir avant la 7 (Béné et al. 2016), etc. La végétation de l'Afrique (The vegetation for Africa) est présentée en deux versions : la première est anglaise (White, 1983) et la seconde, quant à elle est française (White, 1986). Quand vous citer la référence White (1983), elle doit être en version anglaise et non en français</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):

Excellent travail émanant d'une approche méthodologique bien structurée.

Je vous exhorte à pousser une autre réflexion sur les plantes à fort potentielle de valorisation, en consultant la revue scientifique (Phytochimie, toxicologie et pharmacologie) pour un feed-back vers les communautés détentrices de ces savoirs endogènes.

Aborder la répartition géographique de chaque espèce serait également très intéressant, car cette dernière recoupe également son aire d'usage, gage essentiel pour attester les usages les plus significatives des drogues médicinales.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: 29/01/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/02/2026
Manuscript Title: Diversité et usages des plantes médicinales des forêts sacrées de la région de Kankan, Guinée	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 26	
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: No	
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.	5
<i>The title is very clear and adequate to the content of the article .</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4.5
<i>(the abstract presents objectives , methods and results</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>They are just few sentences to review</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The study methods are well explained, however, I want the clarification on how the authors link the common names given by the informants to the scientific name of the 259 species. Did they use software to identify some of these species. If yes which one?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4.5
<i>Results are clear enough</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.5
<i>The conclusions and summary are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Authors have to review all the references according to the ESJ citations of references</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):

Authors should review the comments in order to improve the quality of the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: