



Paper: “Menaces D’origine Anthropique Et Habitat De Pan Paniscus Dans La Reserve Naturelle De Sankuru, En Republique Democratique Du Congo”

Corresponding Author: Nyembo Faustin

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p290

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jonah Ratsimbazafy, University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

Reviewer 2: Seheno Andriantsaralaza, University of Antananarivo

Reviewer 3: Mustapha Hassoun, Abdelmalek Essaâdi University, Tetouan, Morocco

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Jonah Ratsimbazafy	Email:
University/Country: University of Antananarivo, Madagascar	
Date Manuscript Received: June 22, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: June 27, 2020
Manuscript Title: Menaces d'origine anthropique et habitat de <i>Pan paniscus</i> dans la Reserve Naturelle de Sankuru, en République Démocratique du Congo	
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: 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No comments about the title. It is clear and adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The use of the different mapping technics showing the evolution of deforestation is very welcome to this kind of research/survey, but additional methods such as the survey of the minimum size of a given number of a bonobo family group is requested for its survival etc. That kind of study is not presented in this study. In addition, how many park rangers assure the patrol of the Reserve while talking the efficiency of the protection of the protected area. All of this information is needed if available to be described. I think that it is possible to do modelling scenarios based on the knowledge of the past deforestation available data. It will be interesting for the readers to learn about what will happen in the next 10 or 20 years.</p> <p>It is always easy for the readers if the results of the findings in the Sankuru Reserve are compared to a good bonobo site in order to better understand the differences and the bad impacts of human disturbance activities.</p> <p>I would appreciate if data are available to present how many people approximately enter to the reserve per year in order to assess the degree of threats.</p> <p>In the recommendations section, I wonder if the use of education/public sensibilization of the local communities must be revealed in addition to the reinforcement of the laws and the allocation of alternatives.</p> <p>Finally, I would also recommend to enlighten what are the implications of this research to help the managers of the reserve to handle efficiently the management of the RNSA></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> In the méthodes et outils section, I think that there is no “e” on ‘appelée’ because the subject “intérieur” is “masculin”. Also, secondaire and primaire in the sentence “... des forêts secondaire et primaire” should have an ‘s’, so it should be “... des forêts secondaires et primaires”</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, but additional methods on the bonobo vital group size etc. should be presented</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Overall, the body of the paper is clear</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> I would appreciate if the authors mention about what are lacking in the method used and more on short and long term requests/activities for the bonobo to prevent their extinction in the RNSA in the conclusion section</p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p>	

Yes

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 research is very information and will help also for many other researchers and park managers, because the methods that they use are very appropriate to assess threats on a given species. Therefore, congratulations to the authors.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No specific comments

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 19-06-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-07-2020
Manuscript Title: Menaces d'origine anthropique et habitat de <i>Pan paniscus</i> dans la Réserve Naturelle de Sankuru, en République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06102/20	
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.

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.8
<i>Corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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.	4
<i>La liste des références à la fin du texte doit être présentée par ordre alphabétique et <u>numérotée</u></i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<u>X</u>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is generally well written, clearly presented, precise, and easy to understand. The paper could be accepted after only **very minor revisions** that takes into account changes directly suggested in the text (see file attached - Revised_102.06.2020 second version.docx). Also, List references at the end of the text should be denoted numerically.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 19-06-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-07-2020
Manuscript Title: Menaces d'origine anthropique et habitat de <i>Pan paniscus</i> dans la Réserve Naturelle de Sankuru, en République Démocratique du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06102/20	
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.

<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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.8
<i>Corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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.	4
<i>La liste des références à la fin du texte doit être présentée par ordre alphabétique et <u>numérotée</u></i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<u>X</u>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript is generally well written, clearly presented, precise, and easy to understand. The paper could be accepted after only **very minor revisions** that takes into account changes directly suggested in the text (see file attached - Revised_102.06.2020 second version.docx). Also, List references at the end of the text should be denoted numerically.