

Paper: “Analyse Socio-Economique des Services Ecosystémiques Forestiers en Zones Soudanienne et Soudano-Sahélienne au Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 04 October 2023

Accepted: 31 December 2023

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Beteo Zongo

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n1p57

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: O. M. Franck Ronald Adjobo

Université de Parakou, (LARDES), Faculté d’Agronomie (FA), Bénin

Reviewer 2: Oscar Assa Kindemin

Université de Parakou, Benin

Reviewer 3: Kouakou Kouakou Paul-Alfred

Université Peleforo GON COULIBALY, Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 4: Ousmane Kansaye

Université ABDOU Moumouni, Niger

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is quite clear and precise. It also corresponds to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well structured and briefly presents the different parts: objective, method and results. However, the methodological part is laconic and the results lack precision in many aspects, for example the reference period for the economic value of supply services. The abstract of results does not include a characterisation of the forests. It is important to remedy these shortcomings and to be fairly concise.

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

For the remaining errors in the document, it's important to read carefully and correct again.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is clear, but there is a lack of connection between the methodology adopted (with the data collected, the analysis tools, etc.) and the theoretical approach adopted.

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

The development of the article is clear and makes it possible to understand the logic developed. However, it is important to highlight certain important analyses, such as the comparison of the two study areas (Sudanian and Sudano-Sahelian zones in Burkina Faso) in relation to the subject of the study, in order to draw useful conclusions.

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

The conclusion will be reviewed in conjunction with the other amendments proposed to the article.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Review the bibliographic reference for greater consistency.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The subject is interesting and always topical. I suggest that the authors take into account the amendments to make the article more eye-catching and, above all, to highlight certain under-exploited aspects.

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

le titre est a revoir

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

oui, mais avec des parties qui ne cadrent pas avec les résultats obtenus.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methode ne cadre avec une partie de l'objectif poursuivi

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

il y a des erreurs et des parties copie coller sans sources. Assez des textes sont du plagiat

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

Non. a revoir et doit être plus soft

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

La référence est à revoir et s'assurer que tous les documents cités sont lus et mentionnent les commentaires utilisés.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer J:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu de l'article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Le résumé présente les objets d'étude, la méthode et les résultats

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

Il n'y a pas de fautes grammaticales ou d'appellation dans le document

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

la méthode est explicite, bien que la méthode d'échantillonnage ne fait pas allusions au niveau village où les enquêtes ont été conduites.

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

Le contenu est clair. Les auteurs ont fournis un effort de concision et ne présente pas d'erreurs

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

La conclusion fait le synthese du travail et des discussions pour harmoniser les resultats à d'autres recherches deja conduites.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Les references citées sont dans la liste de references bibliographique.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

le theme abordé est tres important et présente l'interet que les services ecosystemiques forestiers presentent pour les populations. De la decoule la bonne perception qui entoure les essences forestieres au niveau locale.

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: KOUAKOU KOUAKOU PAUL-ALFRED | |
| University/Country: Ivory Coast | |
| Date Manuscript Received: | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Perception endogène et évaluation économique des services écosystémiques forestiers en zones soudanienne et soudano-sahélienne au Burkina Faso | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| 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. | 4 |
| <i>CLEAR</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>GOOD</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | X |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

THIS MANUSCRIPT IS GOOD AND CAN BE PUBLISHED IN THIS FORM. IT IS WELL WRITTEN. THE METHODOLOGY IS CLEAR. THE LANGAGE LEVEL IS GOOD. THE RESULTS ARE DISCUSSED.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

THIS MANUSCRIPT IS GOOD AND CAN BE PUBLISHED IN THIS FORM. IT IS WELL WRITTEN. THE METHODOLOGY IS CLEAR. THE LANGAGE LEVEL IS GOOD. THE RESULTS ARE DISCUSSED.