



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Dynamiques d’interaction entre les communautés locales et la Réserve Naturelle de Gorille de Lesio-Louna”

Submitted: 28 May 2026

Accepted: 19 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Lone Aminadiou Bouesso Kimbembe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n22p217

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Seidou Abdel Hack Babatoundé Akambi
Université d’Abomey-Calavi, Bénin

Reviewer 2: 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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: SEIDOU Abdel Hack Babatoundé Akambi	
University, Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/07/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/07/26
Manuscript Title: Dynamiques d'interaction entre les communautés locales et la Reserve Naturelle de Gorille de Lesio-Louna	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0640/26	
You agree that 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 for the content of the article.	5
<i>Le titre de l'article est clair et cadre parfaitement avec l'objectif visé et les résultats obtenus</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	3
<i>Le résumé est bien présenté dans le respect des trois parties mais l'auteur gagnerait plus à mettre au niveau des résultats des chiffres ou pourcentages afin d'obtenir des résultats chiffrés</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Pas d'erreur grammaticale notable au niveau de l'écriture</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>L'approche méthodologique est bien structurée mais a besoin de quelques détails pour être plus complète et dans le respect des normes scientifiques</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats obtenus sont appréciables mais doivent être renforcés avec quelques éléments soulignés dans les observations</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>La conclusion est acceptable</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont complètes mais doivent respecter la nouvelle norme CAMES</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): L'article proposé par les auteurs est intéressant et de bonne facture. Cependant, ils doivent prendre en compte les observations mentionnées dans le document pour parfaire sa qualité scientifique.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: