EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Impacts des pressions humaines, y compris minières, sur la dynamique de l'occupation des sols dans la forêt classée de Bandia (2000-2020)"**

Submitted: 28 July 2025
Accepted: 02 September 2025
Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Cisse Ousmane

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n27p63

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ismael Batcho
Université Nationale des Sciences, Technologies, Ingénierie et Mathématiques UNSTIM-Abomey, Benin

Reviewer 2: Jeannot Tra Bi Tra
Université Péléforo Gbon Coulibaly, Côte d'Ivoire

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: TRA BI TRA JEANNOT	
University/Country: Université Péléforo Gbon Coulibaly / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/08/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Deforestation and Mining Pressure: Analysis of Land Use Changes in the Bandia Classified Forest, Thies, Sénégal (2000-2020)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:	

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 refers to deforestation on the one hand and mining pressure on the other. However, the document discusses the impact of human activities, including mining. There is no reason to separate mining pressure from other human activities. The title should have addressed all human activities, including mining.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
The abstract effectively presents the objectives, methods and results clearly.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**

A systematic reading of the document shows that it does not contain grammatical or spelling errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
Indeed, the study presents a detailed explanation of the method used. From data collection to data analysis, everything was well explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
A visual analysis of the maps from 2000 to 2020 instead shows an increase in the area of wooded savannahs in 2020, which moved closer to the mining quarries. How can this be explained?	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**3**
The introduction states that the study's objectives were to identify the main factors responsible for land use changes in the Bandia Reserve between 2000 and 2020, and what are their impacts on the conservation of this ecosystem; In the conclusion, we see that the objective has changed and become a dual one: first, to assess the impact of the Bandia Reserve on the conservation of the neighboring Reserve in the face of mining pressures, and second, to propose a sustainable management model inspired by this reserve for other Reserved Forests in Senegal. There is a mismatch that needs to be addressed.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
Some references cited in the texts are not found in the bibliography. These are: Nguiffo (2011), MINEPAT (2009a); MINEPAT (2009b); Lickert (2013); (Diagne et al., 2024)	

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):

1. Review the study's objectives in relation to the conclusion. In the introduction, the main objective was to characterize land use changes between 2000 and 2020, in relation to anthropogenic pressures, and to assess their impacts on the conservation of the forest ecosystem. The central question was: What are the main factors responsible for land use changes in the Bandia Reserve between 2000 and 2020, and what are their impacts on the conservation of this ecosystem? However, the conclusion mentioned that the study had a dual objective:on the one hand, to assess the impact of the Bandia Reserve on the conservation of the neighboring protected forest in the face of mining pressures, and on the other hand, to propose a sustainable management model inspired by this reserve for other protected forests in Senegal. This is not consistent with the initial objective.
2. Review the visual interpretation of the maps, as wooded savannahs appear to have increased in area in 2020 and are closer to mining quarries in 2020 than in previous years.

3. Review also the bibliography, where some references cited in the text are missing. These are Nguiffo (2011), MINEPAT (2009a); MINEPAT (2009b); Lickert (2013); (Diagne et al., 2024)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No suggestions

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Le titre est bien formulé. Il est assez claire, compréhensible et court
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Le résumé est bien rédigé. Les parties essentielles sont présentes
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Il y a moins d'erreurs grammaticales dans le manuscrit
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Méthodologie assez claire, seulement que l'enquête de terrain n'a pas été abordée
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Le contenu du manuscrit est globalement bien rédigé. Toutefois, les résultats d'enquête de terrain et d'inventaire n'ont pas été présentés
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
Conclusion bien rédigée
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
Plusieurs citations dans le manuscrit n'ont pas été référencées. Le style de référencement est à harmoniser
Please rate the TITLE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
Veuillez tenir compte de mes commentaires dans le manuscrit
