



Paper: “Estimation de la densité des ligneux avec des images drones dans les écosystèmes Sahéliens du Sénégal”

Submitted: 05 June 2025

Accepted: 03 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Diara Sylla

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p154

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Aderewa Amontcha
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Reviewer 2: Kouami Kokou
Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 3: Mory Latif Konate
Université Polytechnique de San Pedro, San Pedro

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Oui

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Oui

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

Le style de rédaction est bonne. Mais quelques fautes ont été soulignées dans le manuscrit

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Oui

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

Oui

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

Oui

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Oui

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

see comment

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

see comment

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

insignificant

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

See comment

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

Well written, but see the authors' guide

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

see comment

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

see comment

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

3

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]

3

*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):

Authors should take comments into account in order to improve the quality of the manuscript.
