

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_92917
Title of the Manuscript:	The Structure and Literary Analysis of Fareferi Libation Text
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is a very good contribution interesting to a different research context in Burkina Faso. The empirical setting, Fareferi Libation Tex, is very interesting because there are not so many publications on this application in this context, and it has a lot of interesting information. In addition, please, find some comments to be addressed in this paper.</p> <p>The abstract has a lot of structural issues. You have information regarding data collection that should be in the methodology. Also, the research design is not well described in the Abstract. The authors should avoid the use of words such as "evident" otherwise research is not useful. Thus, calling the design qualitative is too vague and it needs to be developed.</p> <p>In the introduction, the authors should connect the objective of the study with its importance of it, with the gap of research that was in the abstract. For the background of the language, more information needs to be developed to give a full idea of the background of the language.</p> <p>For the methodology section, there is a break in the structure of the text, and even the style changes from an impersonal text description to a first-person description, which is not suitable for this section.</p> <p>For the results and discussion, you present some authors that should be in the previous sections of the texts, and the authors should focus on connecting the references with the results and make a discussion about it.</p> <p>Finally, there are several issues concerning the sentence structure and grammatical errors in the English throughout the document and I would suggest proper proofreading before resubmitting.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Flavio Andrew do Nascimento Santos
Department, University & Country	School of Business and Innovation, Berlin School of Business and Innovation, Germany