

Paper: “Constraints and Prospects of rice Production in a Climate Change Context in the Sissili Province, Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 19 March 2022

Accepted: 27 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Korotimi Sanou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n23p140](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n23p140)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Sawadogo Nerbéwendé
Unisersité Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: SAWADOGO Nerbéwendé	
University/Country: Unisersité Joseph KI-ZERBO	
Date Manuscript Received: 29-06-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11-07-2022
Manuscript Title: Constraints and prospects of rice production in the Sissili province (Burkina Faso) in a climate change context	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20218	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comment)</i> <i>The title can be reformulated to improve it</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>A brief description of the survey technique that was conducted is missing.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are fewer spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The methodology part must be thoroughly reviewed. The description of the survey technique is absent. The same is true for the sample of producers surveyed.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are clear. An effort has been made in the presentation but this presentation can always be improved	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Conclusion should be improved	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The references are suitable for the study but the criteria for writing references have not been respected at all levels.</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: