

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_83721
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmers' perceptions of pesticide and chemical fertilizer use in market gardening in the Comoé river watershed in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.6

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>On Introduction: the first paragraph:</b> Wish the author could provide statistics showing the extent to which Bukina Faso farmers' have been affected by the use of pesticides and fertilizers. This shall cement the investigated problem at country level.</li><li>Wish the author could extend the introduction section. See the variables presented on the analysis tables and reflect their discussions in this section.</li><li>Reference [8] Too old literature, update it and identity innovations that have occurred world-wide and specifically to Bukina Faso in solving the challenges of using pesticides and fertilizers.</li><li>Generally, the introduction section needs to be sharpened. Much of the referenced materials are from Togo and Benin while basically the study is on Bukina Faso. Would argue that the author to expand this section by bring out the state of the investigated matter on Bukina Faso. Indeed, you can establish the rationale/motivation of the study by looking it at global level and move to country specific or you can look at it within the country specific.</li><li>References [2,3,4,5,6,7] the cited literatures are old ones. Look for the current literature if possible.</li><li>Provide explanation of the computed statistics as shown in table 5</li><li>Discussion: some of the statistics presented in this section are not found on the analysis sections. The author should check what is presented on the table and what is discussed in this section. See more comment on the main document as I have highlighted by track changes.</li><li>Methodology and material. Specify the type of study and insert a paragraph showing how perception was measured. Secondly, provide justification why you have chosen descriptive statistics and not binary models (cross-sectional designs)</li><li>Generally, we encourage the author to use current literature in supporting the arguments.</li></ol>	<p>In the revised version, we made all of the suggested changes.</p> <p>It should be noted that the introduction and the discussion were entirely rewritten in order to incorporate the proposed changes.</p> <p>Additionally, more than a dozen relatively old references were replaced with more recent references.</p> <p>A paragraph on the study type and methods for evaluating perceptions was incorporated into the revised version.</p> <p>The authors chose to report descriptive statistics instead of a binary model given the nature of the variables and the data that were collected.</p> <p>Bibliographical references were updated.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Kindly requesting the author to maintain consistency in language use. The author can choose to US style or UK style throughout the document. For instance, fertiliser vs fertilizer.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript contributes to knowledge pesticides and fertilizers use in Bukina Faso. The substances and clarity of the manuscript should be improved subject to the above comments	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	