

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

Alhousseine Diarra¹

¹ Mohammed VI Polytechnic University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article is quite simple. Nevertheless, it addresses a well-known problem in this part of Africa, namely the impact of the exploitation of a resource that is useful to the local people, namely reed.

However, as with any scientific article, it answers some questions and raises many more.

For example, it takes the time to explain why: "Mining intensity is higher in the low-disturbance environment and lower in the

environment and lower in the high-disturbance environment." Mention this in the abstract.

Or give some specific biological information about why: "This means that the growth of certain rattan species is adapted to certain specific habitats/environments." Mention in the introduction that the introduction as a climate or soil specification than the simple use of the expression "ecological niche", even if it is referenced.

Also, we understand the usefulness and importance of the plant to the population, but it would have been nice if the author had given more details on the ecological usefulness of the plant itself, if any.

A penultimate informational note would have been to explain in the "Data Sampling" section why sampling is done between February and April. I suppose it's a function of the vegetative cycle, but it's always better to say so in a scientific article.

One last point: in the paragraph "Rattan Cutting Pressure Level in Different Media", it would be good to explain that on the one hand, the lowest cutting pressure level in the media is the highest: On the other hand, the lowest cutting pressure was recorded in the highly disturbed environment, i.e. 21% (17 stems cut).

Regarding the form, the first remark is that the figures should be in English and not in French, as this has a very negative impact on the seriousness of the scientific work. The text should also be justified.

There are also a few small typos that need to be corrected.

Otherwise, the article does a good job of presenting a problem and providing some good answers.