

Paper: “Perception Paysanne des Techniques de Conservation des Eaux et des Sols et de Défense et Restauration des sols (CES/DRS) en Afrique de l’Ouest : cas du Burkina Faso et du Niger”

Submitted: 11 January 2022

Accepted: 08 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Kalifa Coulibaly

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p121](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p121)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nana Claudin Karim
Université de Dschang, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Kanga Kouakou Hermann M.
Université Alassane Ouattara, Cote d'Ivoire

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 14/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/01/2022
Manuscript Title: Perception paysanne des techniques de conservation des eaux et des sols et de défense et restauration des sols (CES/DRS) en Afrique de l'Ouest	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 62.01.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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
(Le titre est un peu ambigu. Vous n'avez pas travaillé sur toute l'Afrique de l'ouest alors veuillez préciser les pays concernés. <i>Please insert your comments</i>)	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Les sites d'étude doit être justifiés/ dans la méthodologie l'échantillon des EA; la répartition des EA par pays et localité et l'échantillon des CES/DRS doivent être justifiés. 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le sujet est d'intérêt mais pas assez approfondi et détaillé dans la méthodologie et resultants.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: NANA Claudin Karim	
University/Country: Université de Dschang-Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/01/2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Perception paysanne des techniques de conservation des eaux et des sols et de défense et restauration des sols (CES/DRS) en Afrique de l'Ouest	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 62.01.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

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.	5

<i>Le titre correspond parfaitement au contenu de l'article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2.5
<i>Certaines clarifications restent à faire au niveau de la méthodologie. Notamment en ce qui concerne les choix des sites observés. Les résultats peuvent aussi être complétés, précisément en ce qui concerne les caractéristiques sociodémographiques</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Il existe quelques fautes grammaticales</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
<i>La méthodologie est assez Claire mais manque quelque précisions</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Les résultats de la recherche sont bien structurés mais doivent être complétés pour être plus précises</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>La conclusion est bien élaborée et correspond au contenu de la recherché, même si les auteurs peuvent encore proposer des perspectives au-delà des recommandations formulées.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Les références sont adapté à l'étude. Les auteurs devront les revoir dans le but d'harmoniser la présentation</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):

Le texte est pertinent et présente un intérêt actuel. Cependant en ce qui concerne les profils sociodémographiques des EA, certains paramètres pouvant permettre de mieux analyser leurs perceptions des techniques proposées pour la conservation des eaux et des sols semblent être négligés.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: