



Paper: “Desert Locust Decision Support for Improved Agriculture Production”

Submitted: 15 July 2025

Accepted: 08 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Mansour Mahamane

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Alejandra Santa
Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Omowunmi A. Odeyomi
North Carolina A&T State University, USA

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear, concise, and directly related to the content of the article. It adequately reflects the main focus of the study, The wording is accessible to both academic and practitioner audiences.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides a clear overview of the study by identifying the problem, the objective , the methods, and the results . It is concise, well-structured, and informative.

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

Overall, the article is readable and communicates the main ideas clearly. However, there are noticeable grammatical errors and minor spelling inconsistencies throughout the text that affect the flow of reading. Thorough proofreading and professional language editing would improve clarity, polish, and readability of the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are explained in a clear and structured manner. The paper details the study areas, data sources and the integration of Earth observation datasets with Google Earth Engine. The description of datasets is thorough, and the explanation of decision tree classification is appropriate. The inclusion of figures further clarifies the methodological process. However, while the general workflow is well outlined, more detail on the model validation procedures, accuracy assessment of classifications, limitations and specific contributions of the methods would strengthen the methodological rigor.

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

The body of the paper is generally clear and logically organized, progressing from introduction, methods, and results to discussion and conclusion. The flow of arguments is coherent, and the content remains relevant to the stated objectives. Figures and maps support the narrative effectively. While the structure is solid, minor language errors and formatting inconsistencies occasionally disrupt readability. Additionally, some sections (e.g., Results and Discussion) could benefit from deeper interpretation of findings, particularly focusing on the results and not the tool or methodology used, linking the geospatial outputs to practical decision-making outcomes for agricultural stakeholders. Overall, the paper presents its arguments without major content errors.

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

The conclusion is accurate and aligns with the study's objectives and findings. The summary is supported by the content of the paper, particularly the methods and results. However, the conclusion could be strengthened by explicitly linking the findings back to their practical implications for agricultural productivity and food security as those were the main issues the study aimed to address. Additionally, outlining specific recommendations for policymakers and practitioners, as well as acknowledging study limitations and areas of future research, would make the conclusion more impactful.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is fairly comprehensive and appropriate, covering both foundational and recent works on desert locusts, ecological modeling, and geospatial monitoring. However, there are some inconsistencies between in-text citations and the reference list. Some entries lack complete details such as DOI numbers or proper journal formatting. Additionally, the reference style shows irregularities in punctuation, spacing, and capitalization. To meet academic standards, the authors should carefully cross-check to ensure that every in-text citation is included in the reference list, and vice versa, and that all entries follow a consistent referencing style, preferably the APA referencing style or whichever one is recommended by the journal. Also there some references that need to be updated. Any reference older than 20 years should be updated.

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):

The study makes an important contribution by demonstrating how remote sensing and decision-support platforms can improve locust monitoring and agricultural resilience in West Africa. It addresses a relevant and urgent issue with practical implications for food security. With more

careful proofreading, consistent referencing, additional detail on validation, and stronger discussion of practical applications and results, the paper will be significantly improved.
