

Manuscript: “Evaluation Des Risques D’érosion Hydrique Et Cartographie Des Zones Vulnérables Par La Méthode RUSLE Couplée Aux SIG Et À La Télédétection Dans Le Bassin Versant d’Agoudal En Amont De La Vallée d’Imilchil (Haut Atlas Central, Maroc)”

Submitted: 19 April 2021

Accepted: 21 May 2021

Published: 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author: Youssef Ouadjane

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Sadkaoui Driss, Université Abdelmalek Essaadi, Tetouan

Reviewer 3: Mimich Khalid, Faculty of Sciences, Meknès, Morocco

Reviewer 4: Dr. Oulare Sekouba, Université Félix H.B, Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire

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: SADKAOUI DRISS	
University/Country: Université Abdelmalek Essaadi/ Tetouan	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 avril 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 avr. 2021
Manuscript Title: Risk assessment of water erosion and mapping of vulnerable areas by the RUSLE method coupled with GIS and remote sensing in the Agoudal watershed upstream of the Imilchil valley (HigAtlas Central, Morocco)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 09.05.2021	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Plase insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>language errors are rare and corrected</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>the study methods and the tools used are well developed in the axis: methodology</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

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: MIMICH KHALID	
University/Country: faculty of sciences - Meknès Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/04/21	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/04/21
Manuscript Title: Risk assessment of water erosion and mapping of vulnerable areas by the RUSLE method coupled with GIS and remote sensing in the Agoudal watershed upstream of the Imilchil valley (High Atlas Central, Morocco)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0509/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Ras

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 OULARE Sekouba	
University/Country: Université Félix H.B, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021-04-21	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-05-10
Manuscript Title: Evaluation des risques d'érosion hydrique et cartographie des zones vulnérables par la méthode RUSLE couplée aux SIG et à la télédétection dans le Bassin Versant d'Agoudal en amont de la vallée d'Imilchil (Haut Atlas central, Maroc)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0509/21	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3

results.	
<i>Voir les commentaires dans le texte</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Les fautes d'orthographe, les erreurs de syntaxes et de grammaires sont soulignés directement dans le texte</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2.5
<i>Voir les commentaires dans le texte</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2.5
<i>Voir les commentaires dans le texte</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Voir les commentaires dans le texte</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

La figure 14 qui est la synthèse de tous vos résultats n'est pas suffisamment commentée et interprétée. En outre, certains commentaires et interprétations ne sont pas illustrés par des figures (voir les commentaires dans le texte, j'aurais pu vous donner les numéros de page mais votre article n'est pas numéroté...)

Pour une meilleure compréhension du sujet traité, vous devriez séparer les résultats et la discussion, il faut réserver une section à la discussion des résultats... En parcourant le texte, on remarque certes que certains résultats sont discutés mais la plupart ne le sont pas. La méthodologie n'est pas également discutée, est-elle efficace à 100% ? Il en est de même pour les données... C'est pourquoi il est nécessaire de séparer les résultats et la discussion... Dans la partie discussion, on pourra discuter sur tous les aspects du travail; données, limites méthodologiques, vraisemblance des résultats, etc.