

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95645
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytosociological study of fodder formations in the Plateaux Region of Togo
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community because it provides knowledge of some species though there is no exhaustive list and their respective abundance to complete the information. It should more scientific if there is an addendum of species lists with their respective distribution, abundance,</p> <p>The title does not match the content of the manuscript. An appropriate title should be developed</p> <p>The abstract is good but does not reflect all the findings. The conclusion does not match the results of the study</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically good but needs more improvement</p> <p>The references are very few</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language seems to be ok	
Optional/General comments	The title should be reformulated. The abundance coefficients should be used to calculate the relative abundance of every species. Plants list should be added at the end of the manuscript	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elias Bizuru
Department, University & Country	University of Rwanda, Rwanda