

RESULTS

- Refer to the accompanied reviewer annotated manuscript for numerous editorial issues that need attention.
- Section 3.1.1.2. Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents: There is not discussion of the demographical data and how it influences the other data sets obtain in this investigation – If you cannot meaningfully discuss it, then it is suggested that this section be removed in Methodology and Results sections. NEVER INCLUDE RESULTS THAT ARE NOT fully DISCUSSED!
- “Regarding the administration routes, the main route was oral” - but Table 2 indicates ALL decoctions, infusions, as well as cooking and drying are administered orally, not most as in “main”, mainly imply there is a minority of other routes
- Does the frequency of citation apply to Parts used and preparation method (Table 2)? If not, what are the frequency of citation for preparation method?
- What are sheets? (see Table 2)
- Were leaves not used?
- Bark: root bark or/and stem/branch bark?? – clarify in Table and text
- “This amount sold is not significant between the prefectures ($p < 0.05$)” – but this stat show that it was borderline significant.

DISCUSSION

- Use the same sub-headings (see below) as was employed in the results section, in order to align the two sections, and to make orientation easier for readers of the paper.
 - Ethnobotanical aspects
 - Uses of *Blighia sapida*
 - Aril use (paragraph)
 - Medicinally (paragraph)
 - Culturally (paragraph)
 - Cosmetically (paragraph)
 - Ecosystem services (paragraph)
 - Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (???)
 - Habitat, management method and prohibitions related to the use of *Blighia sapida*
 - Habitat (paragraph)
 - Management method (paragraph)
 - Prohibitions (paragraph)
 - Socio-economic aspects
 - Market price (paragraph)
- BUT WHAT DOES ALL MEAN FOR TOGO PEOPLE, SUSTAINABLE USE MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF *B. sapida*??? To focus your above discussion exclusively on comparing your study results with other (The so-called: ‘I-found-they-found’ principle) is not adequate for an international paper at this level. The function of a discussion is to provide context to the observed data, which the ‘I-found-they-found’ principle do not provide. It must be indicated why the data was found in the observed frequency (Thus what factors led to the observed traits being found in the prevalent level – thus: why do we see what we see at that frequency?). What would the impact of the observed data? etc etc. If your data differs from other studies, then present an explanation as to the possible reasons. What recommendations can you put forth, and what would be their impact, especially with “and subsequent more sustainable management” as stated in the last sentence of Introduction section). All discussion must circle back to sustainable management because it is one of the stated objectives of this paper.
- Refer to the accompanied reviewer annotated manuscript for numerous editorial issues that need attention.

	Martin Potgieter
Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa

Checked by: ME

Approved by: CEO

Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)