

# Review of: "Ecological diversity, structure and exploitation of rattan stands according to a disturbance gradient around the Nkoltang forest, Estuary province of Gabon"

Jocimar Caiafa Milagre<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal de Santa Maria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript entitled "Ecological diversity, structure and exploitation of rattan stands according to a disturbance gradient around the Nkoltang forest, Estuary province of Gabon" is interesting for publication on the platform; however, some points require attention. Below are these points along with some suggestions:

1. The title should be more concise as it is too long.
2. It is advisable to avoid keywords that are already present in the manuscript's title.
3. Adjust the structure of the abstract: context-objective-materials and methods-important results-implications of results and conclusion.
4. In the abstract, it is mentioned, "Mining intensity is higher..." but in the other sections of the manuscript, this is not addressed.
5. Translate all figures into English. Standardize and improve the descriptions of figure captions.
6. In the description of study sites, include information about the topographical conditions of the locations.
7. The statistical analysis does not mention ANOVA, although it is stated in the results section that ANOVA was performed.
8. The use of multivariate analysis could improve the data analysis, such as employing NMDS (non-metric multidimensional scaling) for the analysis of the floristic composition of the three evaluated sites.
9. In the results section, avoid repeating information already mentioned in the methodology, such as: "In the different environments surveyed, 5 classes of vegetative states of the stems were listed, namely: [0 - 20[ the stems are totally green (good health); [20 - 40[ the stems are mostly green; [40 - 60] the stems are half green; and [60 - 100] the stems are very dry or totally dried out."
10. The introduction and discussion need more generalization.
11. Clearly state the study recommendations in the conclusion and avoid the repetition of expressions like "This study

allowed us."

12. Overall, I recommend revising the manuscript to eliminate minor writing errors, such as those described below:

- "rattan plants. species" – incorrect use of a period.
- "density of rattan stems (ha<sup>-1</sup>)" – superscript.
- "agroecological zones (AEZs) of Cameroon. Indeed, the species *C. deerratus* was found in EAAs 2 and 5 while *L. secundiflorum* and *L. robustum* were found in EAAs 3, 4, and 5" – unexplained acronyms or incorrectly mentioned acronyms.
- "Figure 4. abundance of stems cut by species and habitats" – sentence starting with a lowercase letter.
- "2% *E. macrocarpa* (3 totally green stems)" – incorrect use of italics.
- Incorrect use of italics where not necessary, such as "*The normality of the data has been tested beforehand*"