

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review report. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper. Do not estimate the novelty or the potential impact of the paper. You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 09/18/2018 at 21h	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 09/21/2018
Manuscript Title: DYNAMIQUE DE LA MANGROVE DE THIOBON DANS L'ESTUAIRE DE LA CASAMANCE (SENEGAL) ENTRE 1972 ET 2017	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ISSN: 1857 - 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with an explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title clearly reflects what is dealt with in the document. The dynamics of the mangrove have been well studied and the diachronic analysis of the satellite data shows through the maps realized the changes of the land use</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The summary also explains precisely the purpose of the article, the methodology followed (use of LANDSAT images and the methodology of image processing) to study the dynamics of the mangroves of Thiobon from 1972 to 2017 as well as the results obtained</i>	
3. There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Paper does not have many grammatical or orthographic errors. However, we can report in Introduction, "de Avicennia ", instead put "d'Avicennia"; "ArcGIS " instead of "ARC Gis" and finally "pouvoir calorifique" instead of "pourvoir calorifique" in the Discussions section</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>The methods used for this study, even if they are well defined, deserve to be clarified. For example, no value is given on the separativity index of Jeffries and Matusita as well as the accuracy of the classification</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is clear but contains some errors that should be rectified. In the presentation, it is said that Thiobon is limited to the west by the Casamance River, it is rather the backwater of Etoupaye which is a tributary of the Casamance River which is much further south. So the authors should correct the map and the presentation of the site. In the geometric correction part, it is necessary to put "Points de contrôle au sol" that "GCP (Ground control Point) and not GCP only. Delete Cayman (does not exist in Senegal) in the list of missing or rare animals in the Discussion part. At the level of Figure 5, put two distinct colors between the class oyster picking and the fish smoking.</i> <i>In the Discussions part, I think that in the second scenario, it is only necessary to indicate the years with normal rainfall to surplus since this period goes from 1986 to 2000 and not include the other years that do not fall in this period</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes the summary and the conclusion reflects well what is said in the content of the paper</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and according to the APA citation style.	3
<i>Three articles quoted in the paper do not appear in the list of references. This is (Ducrot, 2005) Lourenco et al., (2015) et Sy et Dieng, 2009</i>	
<i>Include these articles or works in the list of references</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Correct the situation map and the spot symbols on the map to better discriminate against them
For Figure 5, introduce more discrimination in the colors

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments

