



Paper: “Analyse Du Plan National d’Adaptation Aux Changements Climatiques (PNA) Du Burkina Faso Et De Sa Capacité A Atteindre Ses Objectifs”

Corresponding Author: Fiacre Basson

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p149

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: ISSA OUATTARA Institut de Développement Economique et Social (IDES), Bamako, Mali

Reviewer 2: N’DRIN Jean Arnaud, Université Félix HouphouetBoigny de Cocody Abidjan

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Issa OUATTARA	
University/Country : Institut de Développement Economique et Social (IDES), Bamako, Mali	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/08/2020
Manuscript Title: Le Burkina Faso est-il suffisamment outillé pour une planification effective de l'adaptation au climat à l'échelle du pays ?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title reflects the content of the article. But, he need completed of : climate change et no climate (see my proposal in the paper).	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is clear. Objects, methods and results are clearly presented	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
There are few grammatical errors, but there are some spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Yes, The methods of the paper are explained clearly	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
The body of this paper is clear and does not contain errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No comment.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comment.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Saly Sambou	Email:
University/Country: Cheikh Anta Diop University (Dakar, Senegal)	
Date Manuscript Received: August 18, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: September 4 2020
Manuscript Title: Le Burkina Faso est-il suffisamment outillé pour une planification effective de l'adaptation au climat à l'échelle du pays ?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is adapted to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract presents the context, the objects, the methods and the results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	3

mistakes in this article.	
<i>Mistakes have been noted in the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods are explained.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the text is clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>They are supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors for the quality of the paper.

However, I think the paper is a bit long (27 pages).

Some sentences are too long and punctuation is not well done. So, I suggest you review these sentences as well as the punctuation.

A few mistakes have been noted in the text.

Regarding the appendix, I suggest you to summarize it in sentences and insert it in the text.

Review the names of references 49 and 51, because the names of the first authors do not conform to those in the text.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: