ESJ Humanities Peer-reviewed

Quantitative Mapping Using a GIS/RUSLE Approach of Water Erosion of Soils and the Resulting Carbon Losses: The Case of the Fatick Region (Senegal)

Daniel Gomis
Laboratory of Biogeography, Department of Geography, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Cheikh Anta Diop University of Dakar, Dakar-Fann, Senegal
Dethie Ndiaye
Laboratory of Sedimentology and Biostratigraphy,
Department of Geology, Faculty of Sciences and Techniques,
Cheikh Anta Diop University of Dakar, Dakar-Fann, Senegal
Papa Gora Kane
Waly Ngor Sarr
Alioune Badara Dieye
National Institute of Soil Science, Dakar Etoile, Senegal

Doi:10.19044/esj.2026.v22n26p66

Submitted: 03 April 2026
Accepted: 11 September 2026
Published: 30 September 2026

Copyright 2026 Author(s)
Under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0
OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:
Gomis, D., Ndiaye, D., Kane, P.G., Sarr, W.N., & Dieye, A.B. (2026). *Quantitative Mapping Using a GIS/RUSLE Approach of Water Erosion of Soils and the Resulting Carbon Losses: The Case of the Fatick Region (Senegal).* European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 22 (26), 66. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2026.v22n26p66

Abstract

Water erosion is a complex phenomenon linked to both natural and human-induced factors. It causes significant damage in terms of soil loss and loss of organic fertilizers. Therefore, in the Fatick region, to better understand this issue, this study aimed to map and quantify soil losses due to water erosion, as well as their effects on carbon content. In this respect, the empirical universal equations of USLE (Universal Soil Loss Equation) and RUSLE (Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation) were used. The environmental factors involved in the erosion process (climate, topography, soil, land use) were integrated as an information layer within a Geographic Information System (GIS). The results obtained showed soil losses ranging from 0 to 236 t/ha/year. The categorization of the results revealed that the levels of soil loss, "no" and "very low" (i.e., < 5 t/ha/yr), were the most significant, encompassing 99% of

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

the total area. Vegetated areas appear more resistant to water erosion. Carbon losses resulting from this erosion range from 0 to 0.19 t/ha/yr. This study thus highlighted the importance of the RUSLE model in assessing water erosion and its impacts. Mapping these different levels of soil loss could help to better target intervention areas for the effective conservation of these soils.

Keywords: Water erosion, soil, RUSLE, Carbon and Fatick region

Introduction

Water erosion is one of the natural factors that negatively affect soils (Maamar-Kouadri K. et al., 2016). Under the action of rainfall and runoff, it consists of a process of removing the soil layer and its particles, which are transported and deposited along the paths followed by runoff and watercourses. This phenomenon, although favored by natural factors (slope steepness, soil type and structure, high rainfall totals, etc.), accelerates with landscape modifications caused by human activities. Among these, we can mention: deforestation, the shift from extensive to sparse land cover (cultivation of grasslands, etc.), cultivation of plots on steep slopes, overgrazing, etc. (Antoni V. and Darbous F. 2009).

In Senegal, and more specifically in the peanut basin, landscape changes resulting from deforestation and agricultural expansion, both driven by population growth, have led to soil denudation, which consequently accelerates erosion processes (Vidal & Djiba, 2016). This is compounded by certain farming practices, such as peanut cultivation, which leaves the soil completely bare after harvest. All peanut products are, in fact, sold commercially, including the straw, which is sold as animal feed. This situation exacerbates gully erosion and leads to the loss of the topsoil's fertile layer, resulting in decreased productivity and additional costs for conservation or mitigation (Ndour T., 2001; Diallo S. et *al*., 2017; Gerard et *al*., 2020; ENDA/GRAF, 2015). In addition, eroded sediments are generally those richest in clay and fine silt, organic matter, and associated nutrients, particularly carbon, nitrogen, and cations (Roose E. and De Noni G., 2004). Indeed, water erosion is not only considered a factor in stripping soil layers or transporting sediments, but it is also a source of water and nutrient loss.

To address this major soil issue, and given the complexity of the factors involved in the process, several models and methods have been developed and used to assess soil water erosion (USLE, RUSLE, LEAM, PAP/CAR). Among these models, the revised version of the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE/RUSLE) by Wischmeir and Smith (1978) remains the most widely used for predicting losses due to water erosion because of its simplicity and flexibility. Its integration into Geographic Information Systems (GIS) offers several advantages. It allows for the assessment of the average annual erosion

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

rate over large areas, based on a combination of factors responsible for the phenomenon: rainfall, soil type, topography, cropping system, and erosion control practices. Furthermore, it allows for the visualization of results and the representation of the spatial heterogeneity of soil losses related to water erosion.

By applying the RUSLE model to understand the spatial distribution of water erosion in the Fatick region, an administrative unit of the groundnut basin, this study aims to achieve two objectives. The aim is twofold: firstly, to spatially map and quantify the risk of water erosion, and secondly, to assess its consequences on soil carbon losses. This assessment makes it possible to map the area most vulnerable to erosion and to identify the factors influencing soil degradation.

Materials and Methods

Study Area

The study was conducted in the Fatick region, a locality situated in west-central Senegal, specifically between latitudes 13°36’0’ and 14°42’0 North and longitudes 15°30’0’’ and 16°47’0’’ West (Figure 1). It covers an area of 6848.88 km². The terrain is relatively flat (elevations do not exceed 47 m) and includes depressions fed by the Saloum and Diomboss rivers and their tributaries (Figure 1). The climate is of the northern Sudanian type. It is characterized by a long dry season from November to May and a short rainy season from June to October. The average annual rainfall recorded at the Fatick regional station for the period 1984–2024 is 598.6 mm. On the plateaus, the soils of the region are dominated by tropical ferruginous soils, interspersed in places with hydromorphic soils in the valleys (Figure 2). There is also a small presence of ferralitic and poorly developed soils on the plateaus. However, in the amphibious zone, halomorphic soils predominate, followed by poorly developed aeolian soils (Figure 2). The vegetation is quite diverse. In the amphibious zone, it consists of mangrove vegetation, while on the plateaus, it is reduced to patches containing savanna formations, gallery forests, and forest plantations (Figure 2). Agriculture, primarily rainfed, along with livestock farming and fishing, constitutes the main activities of the population.

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)




Figure 1: Geographical location and topography of the Fatick region




Figure 2: Soil types (A) and land cover (B) of the Fatick region

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

Soil Loss

The methodology used in this study is based on the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) of Wischmeyer and Smith (1978). This equation is a multiplicative function that combines several factors influencing the rate of water erosion, namely: climatic aggressiveness, soil erodibility, slope angle and length, land use, and erosion control practices. It is defined by the following expression:

$$A = R \times K \times LS \times C \times P$$

Where:
A: Annual soil loss rate in t/ha/yr;
R: Rainfall erosivity factor (MJ·mm/ha·h·yr);
K: Soil erodibility factor (t·ha·h/ha·MJ·mm);
LS: Topography factor (Length × Slope);
C: Land cover factor (unitless dimension);
P: Factor of anti-erosion farming practices (unitless dimension).

Rainfall Erosivity Factor (R)

The erosivity factor R characterizes the erosive power of rainfall intensity on the soil. The rainfall erosivity factor depends on several parameters, including rainfall intensity and kinetic energy. It is defined by Masson (1971) using the following formula:

$$R = (E \times I30)/685$$

Where E: kinetic energy (J/m²)
I30: maximum 30-minute rainfall intensity (mm/h).

However, this formula remains difficult to apply in regions where rainfall data is irregular. Consequently, numerous equations, used in various studies (Sadiki et al., 2012; El Gouarani et al., 2008) and yielding satisfactory results (Payet, 2012), allow the calculation of the R factor from annual rainfall (Roose, 1971; Renard and Friedmund, 1994). In this study, the erosivity factor was determined using Nguyen's equation (1996) because of its simplicity and robustness, having been validated on the basis of 54 years of observation at several meteorological stations. It is expressed by the following function:

$$R = 0.548 * P - 59.9$$

R = the rainfall erosivity index and P is the annual rainfall;

The rainfall data used for this purpose were collected from the database of the National Civil Aviation and Meteorology Agency (ANACIM). Rainfall averages for the series from 1984 to 2024 from the 24 meteorological stations in Senegal were calculated using Excel. The R factor was then calculated from the average rainfall for each station. The results were entered into a GIS (ArcGIS) and spatialized using the Inverse Distance Weighting (IDW) interpolation method. This method was chosen for its simplicity, as it accurately reflects real-world field data obtained by spatializing them based

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

on the principle of proximity of values, unlike other models that predict values based on the spatial variability of variables (Khali Issa et al., 2016). Indeed, the IDW method is a local deterministic interpolation technique that relies on the assumption that the values of a variable are influenced by data points that are spatially close.

Soil erodibility factor K

The soil erodibility factor K expresses its susceptibility to water erosion and depends on its intrinsic properties, namely its texture, structure, and permeability. In this study, the EPIC (Erosion/Productivity Impact Calculator) model equation was used to determine this factor (Williams, 1995). This method is based solely on soil texture. It is useful when structural and permeability data are lacking. The data used to perform this equation are the proportions of sand, silt, clay, and organic carbon in the soil of the study area. These data were collected from the analysis of 762 soil samples taken by the National Institute of Soil Science (INP) in the study area and entered into the INP database. After calculating the EPIC model in Excel, the results were imported into ArcGIS and interpolated using the IDW method to obtain the K factor raster.

$$\mathbf{K}_{\text{EPIC}} = 0{,}1317 \times \mathbf{F}_{\text{csand}} \times \mathbf{F}_{\text{cl}-\text{si}} \times \mathbf{F}_{\text{orgC}} \times \mathbf{F}_{\text{hisand}}$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{csand}} = 0{,}2+0{,}3\exp\left[-0{,}0256SAN\left(1-\frac{SIL}{100}\right)\right]$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{cl - si}} = \left[\frac{SIL}{CLA+SIL}\right]^{0{,}3}$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{orgC}} = \left[1 - \frac{0{,}25\text{C}}{\text{C}+\exp(3{,}72-2{,}95\text{C})}\right]$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{hisand}} = \left[1 - \frac{0{,}75SN1}{SN1+\exp(-5{,}51+22{,}9SN1)}\right]$$

Where SN1 = 1 - (SAN/100) (representing the fraction of soil that is not sand); SAN = Sand (%); SIL = Silt (%); Cla = Clay (%); and C = Organic Carbon (%).

These four factors in the KEPIC equation represent the different effects of soil properties on its susceptibility to erosion, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Effects of soil properties on its susceptibility to erosion

Term	Property considered	General effect
$\mathbf{F}_{\text{csand}}$	Sand + silt	Effect of sandy texture
$\mathbf{F}_{\text{cl - si}}$	Silt + clay	Sensitivity related to silt
$\mathbf{F}_{\text{orgC}}$	Organic carbon	Protective effect of organic
$\mathbf{F}_{\text{hisand}}$	Sandy/non-sandy fraction	Correction related to highly erodible sand

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)




Figure 3: Distribution of soil sampling points (Source: INP)

Topographic Factor (LS)

The LS factor represents the effect of topography on water erosion. It combines the length (L) and the slope angle (S), which are among the factors that significantly influence soil water erosion. The LS factor was calculated using the equations below, proposed by McCool et al. (1989) and Liu et al. (2015). A 90 m resolution digital elevation model was used to develop these equations. This model was downloaded from the BaseGéo Senegal platform. (https://www.geosenegal.gouv.sn).

$$LS = L*S$$

- L = slope length factor
- S = slope steepness/incline factor

The slope length factor L was calculated using the following equation:

$$L = (\lambda/22.13)^{m}$$

Where λ represents the slope length estimated from flow accumulation and the spatial resolution of the DEM (λ = flow accumulation × cell size). The exponent m was determined based on the slope inclination. Thresholds of 1%, 3%, and 5%, corresponding to 0.57°, 1.72°, and 2.86° respectively, were used to assign m values of 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, and 0.5. Indeed, m is an empirical coefficient that increases with the slope inclination. The steeper the slope, the greater the influence of slope length on erosion. Thus, from the percentage of

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

the slope, the angle was obtained using the following relationship: slope (%) = 100 tan(θ). As an example, for a slope of 1%, we have θ = arctan (0.01), corresponding to a result of 0.57°. Depending on the result obtained, and for each percentage class and corresponding angle, an empirical value m is assigned according to the simplified RUSLE formulation that we used, as expressed below:

$$m = \begin{cases} 0.2 & si\ \theta < 1\% \\ 0.3 & si\ 1\% \leq \theta \leq 3\% \\ 0.4 & si\ 3\% \leq \theta \leq 5\% \\ 0.5 & si\ \theta \geq 5\% \end{cases}$$

With

1% = 0,57°
3% = 1,72°
5% = 2,86°

θ = The slope angle in degrees

Table 2 below summarizes this simplified formulation of RUSLE.

Table 2: Summary of the simplified RUSLE formula for calculating m

Slope (%)	Slope (°)	m
< 1	< 0,57	0,2
1 - 3	0,57 – 1,72	0,3
3 - 5	1,72 – 2,86	0,4
> 5	> 2,86	0,5

In the algebraic map of ArcGIS's arctoolbox, the calculation of m is performed using a series of nested conditions, expressed as follows:

m = Con([Slope] < 0.57, 0.2, Con([Slope] <= 1.72, 0.3, Con([Slope] <= 2.86, 0.4, 0.5)))

This translates literally to: If the slope is less than 0.57°, assign m = 0.2m. Otherwise, if it is less than or equal to 1.72°, give m = 0.3 m. Otherwise, if it is less than or equal to 2.86°, give m = 0.4 m. Otherwise, give m = 0.5 m. Regarding the factor S, it reflects the effect of slope inclination on erosion. Indeed, a gentle slope generally produces less energetic runoff. Conversely, a steep slope increases the speed and energy of the runoff, including the capacity for particle detachment and transport. Thus, according to the empirical Rusle model, the slope is divided into three classes with a corresponding result S, as defined by the following expression:

$$S = \begin{cases} 10.8\ \sin\theta + 0.03 & si\ \theta < 5° \\ 16.8\ \sin\theta - 0.5 & si\ 5° \leq \theta \leq 14° \\ 21.91\ \sin\theta - 0.96 & si\ \theta > 14° \end{cases}$$

θ = Slope angle in degrees

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

In other words, the table below provides a more concise expression of the formula (Table 3)

Table 3: Summary of the three slope angle classes for calculating S

Slope	Formula of S
$\theta < 5°$	$S = 10{,}8 \sin \theta + 0{,}03$
$5° \leq \theta \leq 14°$	$S = 16{,}8 \sin \theta - 0{,}5$
$\theta > 14\circ$	$S = 21{,}91 \sin \theta - 0{,}96$

Just like the m factor, this formula is calculated in the arcGIS algebraic map based on the following conditions:

S = Con([SlopeDeg] < 5, 10.8 * Sin([SlopeDeg] * 0.01745) + 0.03, Con([SlopeDeg] <= 14, 16.8 * Sin([SlopeDeg] * 0.01745) - 0.05, 21.91 * Sin([SlopeDeg] * 0.01745) - 0.96))

Land cover factor C

The C factor is based on the density and height of the vegetation cover on the soil surface (Wischmeier and Smith 1978). Vegetation cover protects the soil and cushions raindrops, slowing runoff and infiltration. C values range from 0 for fully covered land to 1 for fallow land and/or completely naked (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978). Essentially, it assesses the protection offered to the soil by vegetation cover against rainfall, an estimate based primarily on land use during the rainy season. Therefore, for this study, the 2018 land cover database from the Ecological Monitoring Center was used. The study area was extracted from this database. In this study, the erosion sensitivity values were adapted according to the different types of land cover available (Table 4).

Table 4: Land Cover Coefficient C as a function of land cover type

Land Cover Types	Factor C
Watercourse	0
Market gardening	0,5
Rainwater farming	0,8
Dune	1
Gallery forest	0,1
locality	1
Mangrove	0
Pond	0
Forest plantation	0,1
Tree-covered savannah	0,25
Shrub savanna	0,4
Wooded savannah	0,25
Shrub to tree steppe	0,4
Salt flat	1
Mud bog	0

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

Anti-erosion practices factor P

The P factor describes the human actions used to conserve soils and counteract water erosion. These actions include: contour plowing, hilling, ridge tillage, stone bunds, grass strips, etc. The value of the P factor ranges from 0 to 1. A value of 1 represents areas where erosion control practices are absent. However, not having observed these practices in the field and because other similar studies concerning the study area have not found them (B. Sène et al., 2025), not forgetting that soil management by vegetation cover is already taken into account by factor C, the value of P was set at 1. Moreover, in several works, due to the lack of studies and available information, this factor is quantified at 1 (Bustamanto, 2020; Ochoa-cueva et al., 2015).
The resolution of the rasters for each of the factors was reduced to a cell size of 90, 90 to allow for their assumption.




Figure 4: Methodological flowchart of the applied RUSLE model

Estimation of the amount of carbon exported by water erosion

The amount of organic carbon from soils eroded by water erosion was calculated using the following formula:

$$C_{perdue}\ (t/ha/yr) = A \times (C_{sol} / 100)$$

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

• C_{perdue} = Soil organic carbon lost (t/ha/yr)
• A = Soil loss from the RUSLE model (t/ha/yr)
• C_{sol} = Soil organic carbon

Results

Spatial Distribution of RUSLE Model Factors

The spatial representation of the RUSLE model factors highlighted the geographic distribution of each parameter.

The rainfall erosivity map, synthesized from the spatial representation of the hydrological stations, shows that the values of the R factor vary from 174,3 to 332,5 MJ.mm/ha.h.yr. They increase along a north-south gradient, proportionally to rainfall, the abundance of which follows the same pattern (Figure 5a).

The values of the K factor, ranging from 0,008 to 0,024 t.ha.h/ha.MJ.mm, show heterogeneity in the spatial distribution of soil erodibility (Figure 5b). This factor, which depends on soil texture, also varies according to farming practices. According to Roose (1989-1990), K increases rapidly 6 years after clearing, especially in the case of leached tropical ferruginous soils.

The LS factor shows the importance of slope angle and length in the erosion process. It is influenced by the relatively flat topography of the area, resulting in fairly low LS values ranging from 0 to 53 (Figure 5c). The highest values are found in areas with the steepest slopes.

Finally, for the C factor, Figure 5d shows values varying between 0 and 1. This factor reveals the sensitivity of different land cover types to erosion processes. Heavily vegetated areas, such as gallery forests and plantations, were associated with the lowest coefficient (0.1). This coefficient becomes more significant for wooded savanna, tree savanna (0.25), and shrub savanna (0.4) due to bushfires and human pressures that degrade vegetation cover and accelerate the savannaization process. High susceptibility to erosion was associated with bare soils (1), which remain the most vulnerable land cover type, followed by rainfed agricultural areas (0.8).

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)




Figure 5: Spatial distribution of the factors in the RUSLE model

Soil Losses Due to Water Erosion

The soil loss map, created by combining the maps corresponding to the four factors described above using a GIS, shows that the Fatick region exhibits significant variability in terms of soil erosion (Figure 6). Recorded soil losses range from 0 to 236 t/ha/year. This overview map provides concise information on the nature, intensity, and spatial distribution of the phenomenon, and thus allows for the identification of the areas most affected by water erosion.

Based on the classification criteria suggested by Sharma (2010), soil losses were classified into five categories: zero (equal to zero); very low ($0 <$ Soil Loss < 5); low ($5 \leq$ Soil Loss < 10); moderate ($10 \leq$ Soil Loss < 20); and high (≥ 20) (Table 5). According to this classification, in the study area, the level of soil loss in the very low category is the highest (26.4%). Soil losses in the moderate and high categories represent only 0.2% of the total area (Table 5).

Table 5 : Classification of soil losses (T/ha/year)

Soil Loss (T/ha/year)	Classes	Area (ha)	Percentage (%)
SL = 0	None	491248,0	72,61
0 < SL< 5	Very Low	178777,5	26,42
5 ≤ SL<10	Low	5190,4	0,77
10 ≤ SL< 20	Moderate	1135,9	0,17
SL ≥ 20	High	227,9	0,03

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

SL (Soil Loss)





Figure 6 : Hazard Map of Annual Soil Losses from Water Erosion

Depending on the land cover unit, the most significant soil losses were recorded in agricultural areas and in the salt flats and dune units (Figure 7). Conversely, soil losses were lower in the shrubby to wooded savanna, mangroves, and gallery forests (Figure 7).

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)



	CR/M	SS	GF	Lo	Ma	FP	TCS	WS	STS	Sf	MB
SL = 0	23715	44536	1712	6734	57458	6374	17375	7831	177,1	31089	44437
0 < SL < 5	11252	8882	274	2883	798,8	1241	2239	1626	63	11591	2302
5 ≤ SL <10	18821	2122	306	556,3	108,9	423	492,6	340,5	19,7	2694	526,6
10 ≤ SL < 20	2086	373,2	42,5	68	9	66	41,5	61,5	14,5	372	62
≥ 20	156,1	55,9	1,8	1,7	0	6	0	0	0	85,2	30,2

Figure 7: Distribution of soil loss according to land cover units (CR/M = Cultivated Rainwater and market garden areas; Ss = Shrub savanna; Ma= Mangrove; FP = Forest plantation; GP = Gallery Forest; TCS = Tree-covered savannah; WS = Wooded savanna; STS = Shrub-to-tree savanna); Sf = Salt flat; MB = Mud Blog; SL = Soil Loss; Lo = Locality

Soil Carbon Spatialization

Based on available data (a total of 762 samples taken in the region), soil carbon content was spatially mapped by interpolation (Figure 8). According to the results, these soil carbon contents vary between 0,079 and 1,4 Cg/100 g of soil (Figure 8). It should be noted, however, that the carbon data received, while substantial in number, were not sufficiently representative for all units, especially for the mangrove.

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)




Figure 8: Soil carbon content per g/100 g of soil

Loss of Soil Carbon Content due to Water Erosion

The results for soil carbon losses due to water erosion show a range of values from 0,002 to 0,19 $TC.ha^{-1},yr^{-1}$ (Figure 9). The extent and distribution of these losses remain highly variable in space, which would certainly be a function of the level of erosion and the carbon content of the soil.

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)




Figure 9: Soil carbon loss per ton/ha/year

The assessment of carbon loss levels based on surface area yielded five classes (Table 6). Similar to soil losses, carbon losses due to water erosion are largely very low. The remaining carbon losses, in the low, moderate, and high categories, do not exceed 4,5% of the study area.

Table 6: Categorization of annual soil carbon losses due to water erosion

Carbon loss (TC/ha/year)	Classes	Area (ha)	Percentage (%)
[0 - 0,002[	None	498838,0	73,91
[0,002 - 0,01[	Very Low	145842,2	21,61
[0,01 - 0,03[	Low	26708,6	3,96
[0,03 - 0,07[	Moderate	3233,9	0,48
≥ 0,07	High	348,0	0,05

Discussion

This study quantified and modeled soil water erosion in the Fatick region by integrating geospatial data on topography, pedology, land use, and climate into a geographic information system. Combining these data using the RUSLE multiplication function allowed for the creation of a synthetic map of soil loss. Categorizing the results revealed that, despite a range of erosion rates from 0 to 236 t/ha/year, the erosion level is virtually zero for a significant portion of the territory (73%). For the remaining 27% of the territory, the most significant erosion rate falls within the very low category, defined as less than 5 t/ha/year, encompassing 26.4% of the total area. This category, together with

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

the "low" erosion category, represents 27.2% of the total territory. The area most affected by erosion represents 0.2% of the study area. Vegetation areas, especially mangroves, gallery forests, and wooded and arboreal savannas, remain the most resistant to erosion. This is due to the fact that vegetation cover stabilizes the soil and increases its protection by intercepting some of the rainfall (El Hage Hassan et al., 2015). However, this soil protection provided by vegetation cover decreases with the loss of its density. Therefore, apart from the aforementioned vegetation areas, virtually all other units in the study area, including shrub savanna zones, and especially areas devoid of vegetation such as agricultural areas, salt flats, and settlements, suffer the most significant soil losses due to water erosion. This is also exacerbated by the dominance of tropical ferruginous soils in the area, which are highly susceptible to erosion. Indeed, as Payet et al. (2011) indicate, once soils are denuded, their alteration is accelerated by harsh climate, soil fragility, and the rapid mineralization of organic matter; all these processes combined lead to accelerated soil loss. Topography also plays a significant role, as the levels of soil loss in the "moderate" and "high" categories are mostly found on slopes and in low-lying runoff areas. This observation is corroborated by the work of Byizigiro et al. (2020) and Noma et al. (2022), who found that losses are greater in areas with steep slopes.

Compared to other studies, the soil loss results obtained (0 to 236 t/ha/yr) are higher than those estimated in the Saraya Department (0.01 to 134.64 t/ha/yr), which has an average of 33.46 t/ha/yr, although it is also characterized by steeper slopes than our study area, reaching 61.57% of its length (Boisy et al., 2022). This could be explained by the significant vegetation cover in the Saraya Department.

This situation contrasts sharply with that of our study area, which is located in the peanut basin, a predominantly agricultural region where high population density and agricultural pressure have pushed vegetation to its extreme limits. However, soil losses recorded in the study area are lower than those observed on the Thiès plateau, ranging from 0 to 17,652 t/ha/yr, with an average of 3,487 t/ha/yr (Diédhiou et al., 2018). Unlike the study area, which has a relatively flat topography, the significant soil losses recorded on the Thiès plateau are, according to the author, due to the high elevation and the degradation of plant resources. This confirms the assertions that areas at high risk of erosion are located on hills and slopes characterized by steep inclines and favorable substrates (Briss and Brahim, 2018).

The effects of erosion were observed here through the resulting losses in soil carbon content. These losses depend on the volume eroded and the carbon content of the top ten centimeters of soil. They reflect the detrimental consequences of erosion, leading to soil depletion of organic matter and a reduction in its capacity to store atmospheric carbon. Faced with this reality,

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

to maintain soil quality, farmers have a strong incentive to develop cropping systems that reduce losses of organic matter and nutrients through erosion, improve aggregate stability, and progressively increase carbon stocks in the topsoil.

Regarding the RUSLE model used, it is certainly subject to debate. Furthermore, it only assesses losses and does not incorporate gains, thus preventing comprehensive assessments. Despite these limitations, it remains an effective tool for quantifying soil losses and locating areas at risk of water erosion. However, it could be supplemented by field surveys.

Conclusion

This study presents the results of a mapping exercise based on the overlay of the main factors of the Wischmeir and Smith Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) through their integration into a GIS. The results revealed the heterogeneity of soil losses due to water erosion. These losses are most pronounced at very low and low levels and have negative impacts on soil quality due to the resulting carbon losses. This also illustrates the importance of vegetation cover in combating water erosion, as it is at this level that the least soil loss occurs. Overall, it can be concluded that the study area is not highly subject to intensive erosion. However, the loss of vegetation cover linked to agricultural expansion and farming practices related to peanut cultivation, which leave soils completely bare after harvest, does not bode well for the future of combating this phenomenon.

Conflict of Interest: The authors reported no conflict of interest.

Data Availability: All data are included in the content of the paper.

Funding Statement: The authors did not obtain any funding for this research.

References:

1. Antoni V. & Darboux F. (2009). Soil erosion: From the earth to the table. 7 pages. http://www.alimentation-sante.org/documentation/terre_table/
2. Boissy, R., Ndiaye, M., Diatta, M., and Mbaye, M. (2022). Use of a GIS for the assessment and mapping of water erosion risks using the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) in the Department of Saraya (Senegal). VertigO, 22(2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.4000/vertigo.38034
3. Diallo S., Diallo M. D., Nacro H. B., Traore S. A., and N'diaye A. (2017). Edaphic Factors and Dynamics of Agricultural Land in the Groundnut Basin of the Thiès Region (Senegal): Effectiveness of

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

Population Adaptation Strategies. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies, ISSN 2028-9324 Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 12-28

4. Diédhiou A., Lo M. L., Thioune P. B. D., Diouf M., Diallo M. S., and Diaw E. H. B. (2018). Modeling water erosion of cultivated and uncultivated soils on the Thiès plateau (Senegal). *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies,* ISSN 2028-9324 Vol. 25 No. 1 Dec. 2018, pp. 210-221.
5. Driss E. H., Akdim B. (2018). Quantification of Water Erosion Using the Rusle Model and Integrated Deposition in a GIS: The Case of the Oued Isly Watershed (Eastern Morocco). *European Scientific Journal*, 2018, 14 (5), pp. 1857-7881. 10.19044/esj. 2018.v14n5p373. Hal-01773206
6. El Garouani, A., Chen, H., Lewis, L., Tribak, A. and Abahrour, M. (2008). Mapping land use and net erosion from satellite imagery and the Idrisi GIS in northeastern Morocco. *Remote Sensing Review*, 8, 193-201.
7. ENDA/GRAF., The Ecosystemic and Socio-Economic Consequences of the Degradation of the Thiès Plateau on its Areas of Influence. p. 6, 2015. http://www.endagrafsahel.org/IMG/pdf/Consequences_ecosystemiques.pdf.
8. Girard M-C, Walter C., Rémy JC, Berthelin J., and Morel JL, 2011. Soils and the environment. Co-published by ADEME (7048) / DUNOD, Paris, 2011, 881 p.
9. Herbreteau V., Boucheta B., Commagnac L., Lee A. and Chery P., (2003). Evaluation of the sensitivity to erosion of wine-growing areas. Influence of cultivation practices (example of Fronsac). SYMPOSCIENCE: Environmental risk assessment for sustainable land management - IALE France", Cemagref, Écrins National Park, (2003) 31–38
10. Khali I. L., Ben Hamman Lech-Hab K., Raissouni A., El Arrim A., (2016). Quantitative Mapping of Soil Erosion Risk using a GIS/USLE Approach in the Kalaya Watershed (Northwest Morocco). *J. Mater. Environ*. Sci. 7 (8) (2016) 2778-2795.
11. Liu K., Tan G., Jiang L., Zhu A.X., Yang J., and Song X., (2015). Regional-scale calculation of the LS factor using parallel processing. *Computer Science and Geosciences*, 78, 110122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2015.02.00
12. Masson J. M., (1971). Soil erosion by water in a Mediterranean climate. Experimental method for studying eroded quantities at the field scale. Thesis – University of Sciences and Techniques of Languedoc-Roussillon – 213 p.

ISSN: 1857-7881 (Print)
e-ISSN 1857-7431 (Online)

13. McCool DK, Foster GR, Mutchler CK, and Meyer LD., (1989). Revised slope length factor for the universal soil loss equation. *ASAE Transactions*, 32(5), 15711576.
14. Ndour T., (2001). Soil degradation in Senegal: the example of two rural communities (Kaymor and Mont-Rolland). Doctoral thesis in Geography, UCAD, Dakar, 313 p.
15. Nguyen TH., (1996). Identifying factors affecting soil erosion and predicting soil erosion on sloping terrain. Vietnam University of Water Resources (Thuyloi University), Hanoi.
16. Noma AS, Gourfi A., Abdourhamane TA, & Daoudi L., (2022). Water erosion in southwestern Niger : impacts of natural and anthropogenic factors on soil loss. *Géomorphologie Relief Processus Environnement*, 28(2), 7792.
17. Payet, E., Dumas P. & Pennober G., (2012). Modeling of water erosion of soils on a watershed in southwestern Madagascar, the Fiherenana. [*VertigO*], The electronic journal in environmental sciences, vol. 11, no. 3, 2012, pp. 6 and 8.
18. Renard, KG, Freimund, JR. (1995). Use of monthly sampling data to estimate the R factor in the revised USLE. Hydrology Review, Volume 157, Number 1 to 4, 287-306 p.
19. Roose E and De Noni G., (2004). Research on water erosion in Africa: review and perspectives. *Drought* 15(1): 121-129.
20. Roose, E., (1971). Technical note concerning water erosion in Morocco. [Place of publication unknown], 17 pp., mimeographed.
21. Sadiki A., Mesrar, H., Faleh, A., and Chaaouan, J. (2012). Modeling and mapping of water erosion risks: the case of the Oued Larabaa watershed, Morocco. Papeles de Geografía 2012, 55-56, pp. 179-188
22. Sene B., THIOUNE P. B. D., FALL M. M., (2025). Quantification of Water Erosion Using the RUSLE (Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation) Model in the Sine Saloum Watershed (Senegal). *Annals of the University of Moundou, Series A - AFLASH*, Vol. 12(3), December. 2025, e-ISSN: 2707-6830; p-ISSN: 2304-1056
23. Sharma A. (2010). Integration of terrain and vegetation indices to identify areas at risk of soil erosion. GeoSpatial Information Science, 13, 201209. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1180601003426
24. Williams J. R., (1995). The EPIC Model. In: Computer Models of Watershed Hydrology. Edited by *Vijay P. Singh*. Water Resources Publications, Highlands Ranch, Colorado, p. 909–1000
25. Youssef S., (2011). Water erosion in the Maghreb: a case study of the Oued Barbara watershed (northern Tunisia). University of Quebec at Montreal. Master's thesis in Geography. 124 p.