



Paper: “Effets de la diversité des sols et du niveau topographique sur l’activité microbienne et le cycle du carbone en contexte de bas-fonds sud-soudaniens du Burkina Faso”

Submitted: 01 May 2025

Accepted: 01 July 2025

Published: 31 July 2025

Corresponding Author: Daouda Guébré

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n21p153

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gala Bi Trazié Jérémie

Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Cocody (Abidjan), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Adama Ilboudo

Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract includes all required sections. Only minor observations were noted, namely a transition problem between the first two sentences.

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

Some grammatical errors were observed, especially missing words in some sentences.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are clear. But the soil characteristics presented in this section should be in the results chapter in connection with the morphopedological characterization techniques presented in these methods.

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

The body of the document is acceptable but requires improvement. These include revising Figures 1 and 2, italicizing "et al.", and other things noted in the manuscript.

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

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Several references are missing details, such as the name of the journal of publication.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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]
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):

Take into account all observations made in the document.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear and the developed content corresponds

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

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

Some errors exist

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Explanations on the methods are provided.

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

The body of the paper is presented clearly and contains very few errors

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

The CONCLUSION and summary are supported by the content of the paper

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is recent and appropriate. Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa. Some references need to be reviewed in the body of the paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

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]

5

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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
