



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: **“Revue bibliographique sur les études réalisées dans les sites Ramsar en Afrique de l’Ouest (2008 -2023)”**

**Submitted: 05 March 2026**

**Accepted: 19 June 2026**

**Published: 30 June 2026**

Corresponding Author: Malam Bachir Jana Abdoul Wahab

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n18p74

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jihad Bouaida  
Cadi Ayyad University, Morocco

Reviewer 2: Abdoullatif Youchaou  
Abdou Moumouni, Niamey, Niger

Reviewer 3: Nounfro Madjima Soro  
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d’Ivoire

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: YUCHAOU TAWAYE Abdoullatif	
University, Country: ABDOU MOUMOUNI/ NIAMEY-NIGER	
Date Manuscript Received: 13-05-2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 14-05-2026
Manuscript Title: <b>Revue sur les principaux travaux effectués dans les sites Ramsar de l'Afrique de l'Ouest</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12	
You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Oui	
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: Oui	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Il est académique, précis et cohérent. Il peut être amélioré avec l'ajout de la période, comme suggéré</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Des améliorations doivent être apportées à ce niveau</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Les erreurs grammaticales et les fautes sont mineures, elles peuvent facilement être corrigées</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>La méthodologie est assez claire</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Les résultats sont assez bien présentés, on ne trouve pas d'erreurs majeures</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Le résumé et la conclusion doivent être totalement revus</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Les références bibliographiques doivent être soigneusement vérifiées, dans cette section, la plupart des auteurs rapportés ne sont pas cités dans le texte. On peut aussi aisément comprendre que beaucoup de documents ont été consultés sur internet, par contre leurs liens URLs ne sont pas indiqués.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Reject	
--------	--

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Des commentaires et suggestions ont été faits sur le draft ; veuillez les prendre en compte afin d'améliorer la qualité de l'article**

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

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

The title is generally relevant to the subject of the manuscript and reflects the content of the study. However, it could be improved stylistically and scientifically by using a more concise and academically polished formulation. The title adequately indicates that the paper is a bibliographic review on Ramsar sites in West Africa.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

The abstract presents the objectives, methodology, and main findings of the study. However, several grammatical and stylistic corrections are required. Some sentences are too long and contain language inaccuracies. The scientific contribution and methodological approach should be expressed more clearly and concisely. The English abstract also requires linguistic revision by a fluent English speaker.

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

The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, syntax problems, and inconsistencies in scientific writing both in French and English. Several sentences are difficult to read because of poor sentence structure. Examples include:

- incorrect agreement of verbs and nouns,
- repetition of words,
- inconsistent capitalization,
- inaccurate scientific terminology,
- typographical errors in species and geographical names,
- incorrect formatting of references and units.

A thorough language revision is strongly recommended before publication.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology is generally understandable and the bibliographic search strategy is described. The authors clearly indicate the databases consulted and the period considered (2008–2023).

However, important methodological details are missing:

- criteria for inclusion/exclusion of documents,
- procedure for eliminating duplicates,
- exact search equations,
- validation of selected documents,
- justification of the final number of studies retained,

- potential biases associated with database selection.

The methodology section should be strengthened to improve reproducibility and scientific rigor.

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

The results are generally understandable and informative. The manuscript provides useful quantitative information on Ramsar sites in West Africa. However, several inconsistencies and scientific inaccuracies were identified:

- contradictions in some numerical values,
- confusion between hectares and square kilometers,
- formatting errors in tables,
- duplicated dates and incomplete information,
- inconsistencies in totals and percentages,
- lack of statistical analysis,
- some figures and tables are insufficiently explained.

Several sections of the discussion are repetitive and descriptive rather than analytical. The manuscript would benefit from deeper interpretation of the results.

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

The conclusion is generally consistent with the objectives and results of the study. It adequately summarizes the importance of Ramsar sites and the pressures affecting wetlands in West Africa. However, the conclusion remains largely descriptive and should include:

- stronger scientific implications,
- limitations of the study,
- recommendations for future research,
- implications for wetland management and conservation policies.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The reference list is relatively extensive and includes relevant international literature on wetlands and Ramsar sites. However, several issues require correction:

- inconsistent citation style,
- incomplete bibliographic information,
- formatting inconsistencies,
- some references appear difficult to verify,
- URLs are inconsistently presented,
- mismatch between some in-text citations and bibliography entries.

The references should be carefully revised according to the journal's citation guidelines.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the RESULTS 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!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic concerning Ramsar sites and wetlands conservation in West Africa. The bibliographic synthesis provides useful regional information and highlights the growing scientific interest in these ecosystems.

However, the manuscript requires substantial revision before it can be considered for publication.

The main points requiring improvement are:

1. Thorough linguistic revision in both French and English.
2. Strengthening of the methodology section with clearer inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3. Correction of numerical inconsistencies and formatting problems in tables.
4. Improvement of the scientific discussion with deeper analytical interpretation.
5. Standardization and verification of all references.
6. Clarification of units (hectares vs km<sup>2</sup>) throughout the manuscript.
7. Improvement of figure and table captions and explanations.
8. Reduction of repetitive statements in the discussion section.
9. Addition of study limitations and future research perspectives.

The topic is scientifically valuable, but major revisions are necessary to improve the scientific rigor and overall quality of the manuscript.

-----  
 Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

Titre : Revues sur les principaux travaux effectués dans les sites Ramsar de l’Afrique de l’Ouest

Problèmes : “Revue sur...” → formulation maladroite

Suggestion :

- A systematic review of scientific research on Ramsar sites in West Africa

ou en français :

- Synthèse systématique des recherches scientifiques sur les sites Ramsar en Afrique de l'Ouest

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

Problèmes de langue et style : phrases longues et mal structurées, fautes (eu égard → ok mais lourd / réalcalisées → faute (réalisées), manque de fluidité scientifique.

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

Je recommande une révision linguistique complète

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Manque de méthodologie claire : à soulever fortement.

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

La discussion est faible scientifiquement et ressemble davantage à une description des résultats qu'à une vraie discussion. Répétition des chiffres et aucune mise en perspective scientifique. Une discussion doit interpréter les résultats, les comparer à la littérature et expliquer les tendances.

The discussion section remains largely descriptive and does not provide sufficient scientific interpretation of the results. The authors are encouraged to go beyond the presentation of numerical findings and to critically analyze the observed patterns. In particular, the manuscript lacks comparison with previous studies conducted in similar ecological or geographical contexts.

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

La conclusion est trop descriptive, peu synthétique et sans vraie valeur ajoutée scientifique. The conclusion is mostly descriptive and does not adequately highlight the scientific contribution of the study. The authors should clearly state the novelty and added value of their work. In addition, more specific recommendations and future research directions are needed.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

need revision

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the RESULTS 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]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Amélioration méthodologique  
Approfondissement scientifique  
Réécriture partielle Discussion/Conclusion

-----