



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Interface Homme-serpents en zone urbaine et péri-urbaine du Burkina Faso (Afrique de l’Ouest)”

Submitted: 25 March 2025

Accepted: 09 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Idrissa Kabore

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n3p106

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moulay Abdeljalil Ait Baamrane
Ibn Zohr University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Moulay Abdeljalil AIT BAAMRANE	
University/Country: Ibn Zohr University / Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: September 19.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: September 27.2025
Manuscript Title: Interface Homme-serpents en zone tropicale sahéenne (Burkina Faso, Afrique de l'Ouest)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0433/25	
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: 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.	1
The title of the article seems to me to be inadequate for the content of the document. In the title, the authors refer to the "Sahelian tropical zone" which is a very large area covering several countries, but the site of their study hardly extends beyond Ouagadougou and its bordering zone.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
The abstract is not very well developed; - Lack of consistency in the problem addressed	

- The stated objective « <i>Afin de déterminer le rôle des serpents dans les écosystèmes en zones urbaines et périphériques et de promouvoir la gestion durable de l'herpétofaune</i> » does not correspond to the results obtained	
- The methodology lacks clarity	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
See in the text	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
The methodology is not very well explained, especially for the sampling effort in the city of Ouagadougou and in the surrounding area and which risks distorting interpretations if the sampling effort were not balanced. Also, for the ethno-zoological surveys section, no idea about the questionnaire or the number or nature of the people who responded to the questionnaire. Finally, no idea about the statistical processing.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
The typology of the results presented is purely descriptive without any statistical analysis. Also, errors were noted concerning the percentages (see remarks in the text)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
The discussion needs to be further developed by exploiting the results obtained, especially by statistically analyzing the differences between the study locations and by focusing on the sampling biotopes. Also, the section concerning the bitten areas of the body must be statistically analyzed to detect possible differences. In the conclusion, the authors once again extrapolate the results obtained for the city of Ouagadougou and its surroundings to the entire Sahelian zone.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
Several bibliographic references cited in the text cannot be found in the bibliographic list and conversely, references listed in the bibliography do not exist anywhere in the text	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In my personal opinion, the document is on the verge of rejection and requires a major revision for the following reasons:

- The problem requires revision and significant improvement to define real and realistic objectives.
- The methodology also needs to be reviewed; many gray areas need to be clarified (sampling, sample size, statistical analyses, etc.).
- The discussion of the results remains evasive and superficial.
- The list of bibliographic references is far from complete in both senses (references cited in the text but absent from the list, and references appearing in the list but missing from the text).