

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52832

Date: July 15, 2025

Title: UNDERSTANDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AGROECOLOGICAL PRACTICES IN EASTERN BURKINA FASO: THE ROLE OF RESOURCE ACCESS AND FARMER PROFILES

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: DrLakhdar Guerine

Date: July 15, 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

REVIEWER'S REPORT

This study investigates agroecological practices in eastern Burkina Faso, focusing on how farmer resources and profiles shape adoption. Using interviews with 292 farmers and biomass measurements, it compares two techniques: stone rows plus crop residue burial and organic manure, versus stone rows plus zai pits and manure. Poorer farmers showed higher agroecological integration despite having less land, livestock, and equipment. Average biomass yields were similar between techniques. Adoption barriers include lack of tools, financial constraints, labor shortages, and land tenure insecurity. Wealthier farmers cultivated larger areas but engaged less in agroecological intensification. Promoting credit and mechanization could improve adoption.

Strengths

- a) Rich empirical data, combining social surveys and agronomic measurements
- b) Clear statistical analyses linking farmer typology to agroecological practices
- c) Valuable insights into socio-economic barriers to sustainable agriculture
- d) Relevant and significant topic for sustainable land management and climate adaptation

Weaknesses

- 1) English language requires significant editing for grammar and clarity in several sections
- 2) Some methodological descriptions are overly lengthy and could be more concise
- 3) Tables and figures are sometimes difficult to interpret due to formatting issues
- 4) Discussion could better connect findings to global literature on agroecological transitions

Recommendations : Minor revision

Requires substantial English editing, clearer presentation of tables and figures, and tightening of the narrative. The research question, methods, and findings are solid and contribute meaningfully to agroecological research.