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

Augustine O. Edegbene

Abstract

The abstract deviates from the main aim of the study. The authors mentioned the level of disturbances and how they support the diversity and abundance of the rattan stand. This was not stated in the study aim. Overall, the abstract is not a true reflection of the write-up in the body of the manuscript. Consider recrafting for clarity.

Introduction

The introduction was fairly well written. However, the first three to four paragraphs of the introduction laid more emphasis on the diversity, abundance, and distribution of rattan stands in Asia. I am wondering why more emphasis should be laid on studies elsewhere without first laying a foundation on similar studies conducted in Africa. Again, the study aim was not clearly stated: why the study? What is the implication of the study? In the abstract, you said something about the gradient of forest disturbances, but nothing of such was mentioned in the introduction. How does your study improve the knowledge of the topic of discussion in the study area as well as Africa? I will suggest you lay more emphasis on studies of rattan in Africa and Gabon in particular. Reduce the emphasis in East Asia and Asia, but you can use them to back up the discussion of your findings in the discussion section.

Presentation of the Study Area

This section is okay, but what do you mean by "The vegetation of the environment is anthropogenic"? Please explain.

Choice of Study Sites

What is NTFP? Always write abbreviations or acronyms in full at first mention. How did you come about the classification of the undisturbed habitat, the moderately disturbed environment, and the highly disturbed environment? Who classified them, and what criteria did they use in the classification? Then how does this site delineation affect your current study?

Data Collection Methodology

Okay.

Data Analysis and Processing

Please present a detailed data analysis section. What you presented here looks like a sketch of what you did or intended to do. What kind of statistical software is Ri386 version 3.4.0, or do you mean R statistics? You mentioned you performed a normality test? Which normality test? What was the outcome of the test, and how did the outcome inform the kind of statistical tools you deployed for analyzing the dataset you collected during the sampling period.

Results

Most of the statistics you presented here were not reported in the data analysis section; please reconcile. Overall, the results were poorly presented. Just presenting results in tables and figures is not enough. The test for normality you claimed you performed aided you in arriving at what? Please revisit the section and rework accordingly.

Discussion

I did not look at the section, as the results need rework. Kindly rework the results and discuss in line with your findings. I will look at this section in your next submission.