

Paper: "Etude de l'Erosion Hydrique dans le Contexte Sahélien par l'Analyse

Statistique des Paramètres Géo-Morphométriques et des Données

Pluviométriques : Cas du Bassin Versant du Ferlo"

Submitted: 01 August 2023 Accepted: 02 November 2023 Published: 30 November 2023

Corresponding Author: Gallo Niang

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n32p34

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mamadou Thior

Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Sénégal

Reviewer 2: Yaya Dosso

Alassane Ouattara University, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Youssef Hamdach

Chouaib Doukkali University, El Jadida, Morocco

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Mamadou Thior	
University/Country:Université Cheikh Ant	a Diop /Sénégal
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the	ne paper: Yes/No
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper: Yes/No	aper, is available in the "review history" of the
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(Please insert your comments)	•

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
(Please insert your comments)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	No
(Please insert your comments)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Yes
(Please insert your comments)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	Yes
(Please insert your comments)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Yes
(Please insert your comments)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Yes
(Please insert your comments)	

## 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):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** 

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author	of the paper: No
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
the title is well-worded	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
the summary is acceptable	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
the text contains errors that the author must correct	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
THE METHODOLOGY IS FAIRLY DETAILED	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
the results are fairly reliable	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
the conclusion meets scientific standards	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
The bibliography does not meet CAMES standards	

### **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 article is admissible. However, there are some syntaxes corrections that mar its quality.

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

Reviewer ^:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

#### The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Le titre ne reflète pas le contenu de l'article. L'article s'est concentré uniquement sur le rôle des facteurs climatiques et les paramètres morphométriques, alors que le titre est l'érosion hydrique. Le titre de l'article doit être modifié pour s'adapter au contenu.

### The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Oui, le résumé présente clairement les objectifs, les méthodes et les résultats

#### There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Il n'y a pas beaucoup des fautes de grammaire ou d'orthographe

### The study METHODS are explained clearly.

oui, les méthodes d'étude sont clairement expliquées

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

oui, il est clair

#### The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

la conclusion est bien rédigé, il résume les principales conclusions de la recherche

#### The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

- une citation n'est pas inclus dans la liste des références exemple: (Léprun,1971)
- des citation n'est pas inclus dans le texte exemple:
- 6. Devne, M. P., Mundhe, N. N., Kamble, A. H., & Dhawale, G. M. (2019, Août). Morphometric Analysis of Kolavadi Sub-Watershed in Bhor Tahsil Using GIS Techniques. Journal of geographical studies, 1(10), pp. 87-96.
- 7. Diouf, R.-N. (2011). Etude hydro-pluviométrique des bassins versants urbains de la presqu'île du Cap-Vert. Thèse de Doctorat de troisième cycle, UCAD, Département de Géographie, Dakar.
- 15. Hangnon, H., De Longueville, F., & Ozer, P. (2015, Juillet 1-4). Précipitations 'extrêmes' et inondaion à Ouagadougou : quand le développement urbain est mal maîtrisé. Collogue de l'Association Internationale de Climatologie, pp. 497-502.
- 31. Umair, A., & Syed, A. A. (2014). Analysis of Drainage Morphometry and Watershed Prioritization of Romushi Sasar Catchment, Kashmir Valley, India using

Remote Sensing and GIS Technology. International Journal of Advanced Research, 12(2), pp. 5-23.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

```
[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
```

4
Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed
<b>Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):</b>
Le titre de l'article doit être modifié pour s'adapter au contenu. La liste de références et de citation doit être revue

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]