

Paper: “Vulnérabilité des Produits Forestiers non Ligneux 'Vitellaria Paradoxa' et 'Parkia Biglobosa' au Burkina Faso - Une Évaluation des Perceptions de la Population Locale Basée sur le Genre et l'Ethnicité”

Submitted: 29 August 2022

Accepted: 29 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Pascaline Coulibaly-Lingani

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p164](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n2p164)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stefan Vladutescu
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Mondira Dutta
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 3: Edna Johnny
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the manuscript is adequate to the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract presents objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method utilized is clearly explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

This manuscript has an actual and interesting research idea.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

From bibliography are missing references from 2021 and 2022.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript needs minor corrections:

a) completing the bibliography with references from the years 2021 and 2022 (since

the references from these years are missing);
b) introduction of a "Future research" section.

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title does not reflect the content of the article. Consider the following:

Vulnerability of Non-Timber Forest Products 'Vitellaria Paradoxa' and 'Parkia Biglobosa' in Burkina Faso - An Assessment to Perceptions of Local Population based on Gender and Ethnicity

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Fairly clear and does generate an interest to read further. However a rationale ought to have been stated in a couple of lines as to why the perceptions of gender and ethnic groups was important to assess.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are few sentences which lose the meaning. For example sometimes sentences are too long. It needs to be split into two or more sentences to make it more comprehensible. For example the beginning line in abstract itself states, "The objective of this study is to investigate knowledge and perception of local populations based on gender and ethnicity about factors that constitute a threat to the two species that are Vitellaria paradoxa and Parkia biglobosa, and to determine their causes. " This would become more easy to understand by breaking the sentence into two or three smaller sentences.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study area has been well depicted and clearly displayed in the map. However the reasons and rationale to select the two villages of Bana and Yarci have not been specified. Why were these two villages selected over the others. One from the northern part and the other from the southern part. The methodology does not state the sample magnitude nor the sample design. It seems to be a qualitative study based on focussed group discussion. Each focussed group consisting around 10 adults consisting of men and women. Some socio-economic profile of the participants ought to have been discussed. Were these from low socio economic profile ? What was the gender composition of these participants? If this was based on a 5-point likert scale then what is the rationale for using statistical

tools such a Chi Square test and SPSS.

A little more clarity in sample design and the primary survey needs to be detailed. At the moment there is nothing clear beyond the FGDs and a qualitative survey.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper on the whole is an interesting study considering papers on such regions are rare and information is difficult to gather. Given the background that various coups have taken place and the recent ones being in September 2022. It is one among the least developed countries.

The research questions have not been clearly stated in terms of its objectives.

Although the data analysis is a short para but the analysis that follows does not justify the data collected from the field. The body could have been divided into clear sections such as classification of threats, Gender perceptions of threats, Perceptions by Ethnic Groups. The body of the paper does not seem convincing as research questions are missing from the study.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The Conclusions are rather generic in nature and does not reflect the study in particular. The findings do not display any relationship to the perceptions based on Gender and ethnic groups in the present study. In fact it states, "threats, resulting from anthropic actions remain the most violent and the most hostile to the survival of species". Recommendations do not emerge loud and clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are satisfactory but needs to be displayed in APA style.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please specify some research questions based on objectives in bullet points.
Discuss the structure of the paper according to the research questions.
It is not necessary to convert all research papers into quantitative study.
A qualitative study can be equally significant. Add a few case studies or some
comments by the participants in boxes within the text.
