

Paper: “Community Forests of Rogho and Boala, Significant Carbon Sinks in the Center-West Region of Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 13 April 2023

Accepted: 29 May 2023

Published: 31 May 2023

Corresponding Author: Kasimou Tiamiyu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p145](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p145)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kessy Gilly

Mwenge Catholic University, Moshi, Tanzania

Reviewer 2: Itumeleng Letsolo

Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear, concise, and accurate as it reflects the content of the article, which is about the role of community forests in sequestering carbon in the Center-West region of Burkina Faso.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well-written and provides a clear overview of the study. The methods used are sound and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The study's findings are significant as they provide valuable information on the carbon stock potential of community forests in Burkina Faso. The study also highlights the need to strengthen the management of these forest areas to further improve their carbon storage potential. Overall, the abstract is a good representation of the study and its findings. It is well-written, informative, and provides a clear overview of the study's methodology and results.

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

Yes, there are few grammatical errors but the paper is publishable.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods used are sound and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner reflecting the study objectives.

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

Yes, the body is well constructed and clear

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

The conclusion is well organized reflecting the findings of the study

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are all ok just, need to be indented

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: ITUMELENG LETSOLO	
University/Country: AFRICA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY	
Date Manuscript Received: 23 rd May 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 th May 2026
Manuscript Title: Community forests of Rogho and Boala, significant carbon sinks in the Center-West region of Burkina Faso	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0468/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: 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.

Questions	Rating Result
	[Poor] 1-5
	[Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The title is clear however looking at the objectives of the study, the title can furthermore be enhanced to accommodate that second objective of the study of spartialization</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is well written and objects, methods and results are clearly shown.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are few format issues where the reference years were not put in brackets. There is a formatting issue and inconsistent formatting (page 3). Some tables are also outside the margin</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>There study method is clearly explained with enough references</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clearly shown and well supported by the equations that were used.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusion even though too brief, is straight to the point.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>References are comprehensive and majority are not more than 5 years old. They are relevant to the current study</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):

1. To address the comments highlighted and review suggested changes in the body of the document.
2. To also go through the document especially the first 4 pages to ensure that formatting is consistent and that tables are also resized to fit the margin of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

1. To encourage students to proof read work thoroughly and use modern tools available nowadays to at least contain grammatical and formatting discrepancies