

Manuscript: “**Dynamique Hydro-Erosive Actuelle Des Bassins Versants Endoreiques De La Region De Niamey (Sud-Ouest Du Niger)**”

Submitted: 25 July 2020

Accepted: 30 September 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Moussa Malam Abdou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p149

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ibrahim Sani, Niger

Reviewer 2: Abdourhamane Touré Amadou, Niger

Reviewer 3: Sadiki Mohamed, Morocco

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr rer.nat. IBRAHIM Sani	
University/Country: Niger	
Date Manuscript Received: 30.07.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.08.2020
Manuscript Title: Dynamique hydro-erosive actuelle des bassins versants endoreiques sahelien	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

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

<i>Questions</i>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The study area and experiments are limited to the western part of a Sahelian country. In the eastern part: processes, geomorphic and climatic conditions are different. Thus, the author should accurate the title by adding/ précising the investigation area's name/case/location: Ex.:... case of:.....</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Objects and results are clearly presented but the methods not! In this part of the</i>	

<i>article, the authors cited only plots, measurements tools and instrumentations of the study area. Nevertheless, in the details of the article corpus, the method is well described. The last could be summarise and integrated in the abstract corpus.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article was written in a correct grammatical form. However, they are few inattention mistakes errors that could be easily corrected. Accordingly, the authors ought reread the text again</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Yes, but must be adjusted for more clarity. The authors presented the general characteristic of the study area in the methodological part. It might be placed after the introduction or a part separately. On another way, authors must describe succinctly the applied/used erosion evaluation model/test.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Yes, but some coquilles/very minor errors exist. A part of the article's body must be readjusted for more suitability</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusion is not precisely related / linked to the article's title and corpus! In the fact, it talks about degradation processes in general! It should normally make links between measured specific degradation in the study area, soil surface characteristics, rain-fall intensity/erosion potential, water and sediments flow/debits in the context of the study area/ Sahel zone.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>All cited authors are well internationally known as water and/or wind erosion researchers. I personally know some of them. They have long research stay in Sahelian countries in general and in Niger particularly..</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The fieldwork seems well furnished with measurement tools (that are threatened in Sahelian countries) and much more data are acquired. Hence, other analysis such as sedimentation rate and quantification could be done for better and expressive results! This could help in the case of land degradation assessment for decision makers and also for interested scientists...

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/08/2020
Manuscript Title: DYNAMIQUE HYDRO-EROSIVE ACTUELLE DES BASSINS VERSANTS ENDOREIQUES SAHELIENS	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 27.08.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	3
<i>Le titre nécessite une précision car la prétention est trop grande relativement à ce qui est réellement traité dans le corps de la proposition d'article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>La démarche méthodologique doit être complétée...certaines méthodes n'ont apparu qu'en résultats de même que certains outils.. il est nécessaire d'apporter une amélioration à ce niveau.</i>	
<i>Les résultats sont intéressants mais les interprétations sont souvent approximatives et pas suffisamment rigoureuses. Une relecture profonde permettra de remonter ces insuffisances</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>La syntaxe à certains égards doit être améliorée</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>La démarche méthodologie du travail est intéressante mais insuffisamment clarifiée pour le lecteur, chose surmontable.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>ok</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>La conclusion et le résumé sont bien structurés mais doivent tenir compte des insuffisances du document pour être revus et améliorés.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>ok</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. 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 peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

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

Reviewer Name: Sadiki Mohamed	Email:
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/08/20	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: DYNAMIQUE HYDRO-EROSIVE ACTUELLE DES BASSINS VERSANTS ENDOREIQUES SAHELIENS	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough 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.	4
<i>Maybe it would be better if we talked about runoff or runoff dynamics.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is clear but it's better when using simple sentences</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some ideas were poorly expressed and there is no spelling mistakes</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method used is clear but it was necessary to use the surfaces having the same slope if possible</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>The body of this paper is suitable</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>To generalize the conclusion, I think we need to do more studies to have the conclusions on the entire watershed</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>If possible write et al., for long references</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In my opinion, I think they worked in a large group and if possible to add the water table effect (piezometric level) because according to the literature there are two things that trigger the runoff: when the soil is saturated (nearby water table) or well if the balance crust is formed (hortonian runoff)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

/////