



Paper: “Dynamiques de l’occupation du sol et du ravinement dans le bassin versant d’un petit affluent du fleuve Niger : kori Ganguel (sud-ouest Niger)”

Submitted: 03 June 2025

Accepted: 29 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Amadou Abdourhamane Toure

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n26p142

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hassan Lemacha

Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Noel Watha-Ndoudy

Institut National de Recherche Forestière, Brazzaville, Congo
Laboratoire de Géosciences,
Faculté des Sciences et Techniques, UMNG, Brazzaville, Congo

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Pr. Hassan LEMACHA	
University/Country: Université Hassan II de Casablanca, Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 09-06-2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 27-06-2025
Manuscript Title: DYNAMIQUES DE L'OCCUPATION DU SOL ET DU RAVINEMENT DANS LE BASSIN VERSANT D'UN PETIT AFFLUENT DU FLEUVE NIGER : KORI GANGUEL (SUD-OUEST NIGER).	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 46/25	
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. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<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):

1. Ajouter une adresse mail ;
2. Des mots clés ne figurant pas dans le résumé ;
3. Utiliser les mêmes mots clés pour le résumé en français et en anglais ;
4. Revoir la figure 4;
5. Des corrections sont marquées en jaune à supprimer et bleu à ajouter ;
6. Respecter la même Police du manuscrit (Times New Roman, 12pts)
7. Ajouter les références + l'année pour toutes les figures ;
8. Ajoutez des références récentes pour améliorer la qualité du travail (2020, 2021, 2024) ;
9. Développer la conclusion.

Bonne chance

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Noel Watha-Ndoudy	
University/Country: Congo Republic	
Date Manuscript Received: 10/07/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Dynamiques de l'occupation du sol et du ravinement dans le bassin versant d'un petit affluent du fleuve Niger : kori Ganguel (sud-ouest Niger).	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: I have no objection	
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.

<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 presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)There are many spelling mistakes in the texte</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.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) The bibliography seems to me to be insufficient, and the references mentioned are sometimes incomplete, sometimes lacking in rigor because they don't comply with the style standard. Indeed, all references must be written in the same style. This is not the case for this bibliography.</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):

There are a few errors that absolutely must be corrected. In yellow is a sentence that makes no sense. For the other observations, I've made remarks in the corrections follow-up mode. The bibliography can be improved by adding further references. Indeed, many authors have written in recent years on erosion and the erosivity index

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: