

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 56840

Title: REVUE DE LA LITTÉRATURE : CONSERVATION DE LA FAUNE SAUVAGE ET SON HABITAT EN AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

1. General Comments

This manuscript presents a literature review on wildlife conservation and habitat in West Africa, addressing an important and relevant topic in biodiversity conservation. The effort to synthesize studies from 2000–2023 is commendable, and the paper highlights key threats and conservation challenges in the region.

However, the manuscript requires minor revisions to improve scientific rigor, methodological transparency, language quality, and overall presentation. The study is valuable but currently lacks the structure and analytical depth expected of a high-quality review paper.

2. Content and Originality

- The topic is relevant and timely, especially considering biodiversity loss in West Africa.
- The manuscript provides a broad overview of:
 - Species diversity
 - Habitat types
 - Conservation status
 - Threats
- However:
 - The review is largely descriptive rather than analytical.
 - There is limited critical synthesis or comparison of studies.
 - No clear research gap or novel insight is highlighted.
- The inclusion of quantitative summaries (e.g., 156 species, percentages) is good, but:
 - It is unclear how representative or exhaustive the dataset is.

Suggestion:

Strengthen originality by:

- Identifying knowledge gaps
- Providing comparative analysis across countries or ecosystems

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Highlighting policy implications

3. Technical Quality

- Methodology section is present but lacks rigor:
 - No systematic review protocol (e.g., PRISMA framework)
 - No clear explanation of:
 - Inclusion/exclusion criteria justification
 - Bias control
 - Data validation
- The formula for frequency relative (FR) appears inappropriate:
 - It resembles field sampling methods, not literature review analysis.
- Data synthesis:
 - No meta-analysis or statistical testing
 - Results are mainly aggregated counts and percentages
- Figures and tables:
 - Not sufficiently described or interpreted in the text
 - Some inconsistencies in percentages across sections

Suggestion:

- Adopt a systematic review approach
- Clarify data extraction and analysis methods
- Remove or justify inappropriate formulas

4. Language and Presentation

- The manuscript is written in both French and English, which is acceptable, but:
 - The English abstract contains spacing and grammatical errors:
 - “achievetthis” → “achieve this”
 - “literaturereviewwasconducted” → spacing issues
- French sections:
 - Several grammatical inconsistencies and typographical errors:
 - Missing accents
 - Sentence structure issues
 - Repetition
- Formatting issues:
 - Inconsistent spacing
 - Poor alignment of tables
 - Mixed font styles in some sections

Suggestion:

- Perform professional language editing
- Ensure consistent formatting throughout

5. Structure and Organization

- The manuscript follows a general structure:
 - Abstract → Introduction → Methods → Results → Discussion → Conclusion
- However:
 - Section numbering is inconsistent (e.g., 2.1, 2.2 without clear section hierarchy)
 - Results and Discussion are too lengthy and partially repetitive

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Tables (especially Table 1) are:
 - Overly dense
 - Difficult to read
 - Poorly formatted
- Figures:
 - Not properly labeled or referenced in standard journal format
 - Captions lack detail

Suggestion:

- Improve section hierarchy
- Simplify and split large tables
- Ensure clear figure captions and numbering

6. References and Citations

- Strengths:
 - Includes a wide range of references (reports, articles, theses)
- Issues:
 - Inconsistent citation style:
 - Mixed formats (APA, Harvard, incomplete styles)
 - Some references are:
 - Irrelevant (e.g., engineering PhD thesis by Jones, 1973)
 - Poorly formatted
 - Missing DOIs in several entries
- In-text citations:
 - Formatting inconsistencies (spacing, punctuation)

Suggestion:

- Use a standard citation style (e.g., APA, Elsevier, Springer)
- Remove irrelevant references
- Update with recent peer-reviewed articles

7. Overall Recommendation

The manuscript has good potential as a regional review paper but requires:

- Methodological strengthening
- Improved analytical depth
- Significant language and formatting corrections

8. Final Decision

Minor Revision Required