

Paper: “Economic evaluation of the direct use values of goods and services provided by the Bagré wetland in Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 26 August 2024

Accepted: 21 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Tapsoba Aicha

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p109](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p109)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Vasilika Kume
Tirana Business University College, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 4: Daniela Breveníková
University of Economics, Slovakia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Vasilika Kume	Email:
University/Country: Tirana Business University College, Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 14/09/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/09/2024
Manuscript Title: Economic evaluation of the direct use values of goods and services provided by the Bagré wetland in Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: OK	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: V	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: V	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title of the paper fully matches the content. I consider that the chosen topic is current and interesting.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(The abstract is well formulated, and the main purpose of the paper is reviewed. In my opinion, the author should include in the abstract what the objectives of this study are. So what does the author aim to achieve and who will this study serve?)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There are no spelling errors</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The author has clearly explained the method of data collection and processing, the conceptual model, the stakeholders involved in the study.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are generally clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are comprehensive. Most of the authors included in the references paragraph are not cited in the text of the paper.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. I think a paragraph for a literature review should be added. Why did you choose this model and data processing technique? Did you compare it with another technique from the literature?
2. Paragraph 2.1 is very long and comprises about 30 percent of the paper. I think it can be shortened.
3. Tables 3, 4, and 6 can be moved to the appendices at the end of the paper because they interrupt the flow of reading.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Daniela Breveníková	
University/Country: Slovak Republic	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 Sept. 2024
Manuscript Title: Economic evaluation of the direct use values of goods and services provided by the Bagré wetland in Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 32. 21.08.2024	
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: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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 corresponds to the content of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The aim of the paper should be explicitly stated in the abstract. It is not clear why the author denotes this part as Summary.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There are minor misprints on p. 2 (capitalization). I also corrected misprints in names of two authors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are clearly explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5

Results of analysis are presented in high-quality tables and figures.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are supported by the paper. Also this part is written clearly and succinctly.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>The References contain relevant sources. However, not all of them are properly recorded in the paper. Three items in the References need to be completed (see the manuscript, part References, containing my corrections). In several cases, there are missing in-text citations, see the manuscript with my notes.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: