ISSN: 2320-5407

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-51820** Date: May 23 2025

Title: THE CORRELATION BETWEEN PRODUCTIVITY AND CROPPING SYSTEMS IN WEST AFRICA : THE CASE OF THE PENSA HYDRO-AGRICULTURAL PERIMETER IN BURKINA FASO

Recommendation:
Accept as it is .....
Accept after minor revision.....
Accept after major revision .....
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		X		
Techn. Quality		X		
Clarity			X	
Significance			X	

Reviewer Name:dr Lakhdar Guerine **Date:** May 23 2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(*To be published with the manuscript in the journal*)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

.....

.....

.....

Detailed Reviewer's Report

ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Strengths

1. Relevant and timely research question: The link between agricultural practices and productivity is crucial for rural development.
2. Robust methodological approach: The study uses econometric models (logit and multiple regression), which add scientific rigor.
3. Clear and quantified results: Profit margins are well calculated for each crop and cropping system.
4. Significant correlation demonstrated: A high R^2 value strengthens the credibility of the analysis.

Weaknesses

1. **Language and academic writing style need revision**:

a) The text contains numerous grammatical, syntactic, and punctuation errors.
b) Several passages are awkward or repetitive.

2. **Occasionally confusing structure**:

a) Section organization could be improved, for instance, a clearer separation between results and discussion.

3. **Insufficient detail in the statistical methodology**:

a) While the choice of the logit model is justified, key assumptions (normality, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity) are not thoroughly examined.

4. **Lack of critical discussion of limitations**:

a) No reflection on potential biases or limitations in the data or analysis.

5. **Literature review is overly descriptive**:

a) It would benefit from a more analytical and focused discussion of previous research.

Recommendations

- Professional language editing for grammar and academic style.
- Reorganize sections for clarity (e.g., clear divisions between Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion).
- Develop a critical discussion on methodological limitations, data bias, and future research directions.
- Reduce redundancy in the presentation of results.
- Revise the map legend and Figure 2, which are still in French, translate them into English.
- Improve the bibliography: standardize formatting and include more recent sources where applicable.