

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

Mariana Nunes Menegat

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction

Paragraphs 5 and 6 - I believe that, at least for the introduction, bringing results from other studies pointing out values (for example, H' index values) is not the best way to insert the "state of the art." However, this criticism may just be due to the different way of scientific writing; please disregard it if, for you, it makes sense and it is necessary to present these values.

Paragraph 10 - I maintain the previous criticism here. Furthermore, I point out that this part makes it difficult to understand when it mentions agroecological zones from another study; I would only understand it if I were to read that article... and I believe that this is not the idea of bringing results from previous studies. The results of previous studies need to be clear and direct, referencing your study, which is the focus here.

Paragraph 13 - I believe that I could insert some hypotheses, making the study more robust and clear.

Very long introduction; from my point of view, it became a "gossip introduction" due to the constant inclusion of results from previous studies. But remember, this consideration could just be different ways of writing; consider it if you think it's relevant. Furthermore, including previous studies (state of the art) in the introduction is extremely important. My tip is just to rethink how to bring this information here, highlighting your study, which is the study in question here.

Data Collection Methodology

Paragraph 1 -

In this sentence: "In each environment, three square plots (100m x 100m) were arranged along a transect of five (05) hundred meters. The regular equidistance between the plots was 100m to ensure the representativeness of the inventory area," I imagine it's five hundred meters, but I didn't understand the 05 in parentheses... it was a little confusing.

"Data on the distribution, growth, and health of the different rattan plots were collected over a period of three months" OK, but every day? Every week?

Results

Paragraph 1 -

“Stem abundance varies with habitat (Figure 2)” - When I read this, I expect the statistic to be significant; however, when I reach the end of the paragraph, I see that it is not.

Three different words to describe your environments in this paragraph: "environments," "habitats," "3 different media." The same happens with terms referring to environments, like "undisturbed environment" and "low." It is always good to stick to a single term; it may seem repetitive, but it makes everything clearer and more objective.

Last paragraph -

There are species names that are not in italics or underlined. It just looks like a formatting error. Review.

Discussion

I believe that you spend a lot of time (text) explaining what your study did not provide, and in fact, does not explain. For example, "...further studies should provide this information." OK, how? What are the gaps left by your study? Since it emphasizes that there are gaps.

Paragraph 2 -

The first part very explicitly brings results, again, as these have already been mentioned in the results topic, making the text repetitive and little discussed.

From my point of view and way of scientific writing, result values don't have to be mentioned again in the discussion. I suggest thinking about that.

Conclusion

I believe that the paper misses a clearer conclusion regarding your objectives.

Figure 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 -I believe that the information contained in the figures can be translated into English, as can the manuscript. Additionally, in the graphics (figures 3, 4 and 5), behind lines can be removed. Finally, in figure 5, there is a parenthesis in the last species in the legend list, and the text is gray and not black like the other figures. To correct.

