



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN: 2320-5407

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 57383

**Title:** AT THE CROSSROADS OF NATURAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES: THE EVALUATION AND PROSPECTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GEOSITES OF BAKEL CITY (TAMBACOUNDA REGION, SENEGAL).

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is

**Accept after minor revision**

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

#### General Comments

The manuscript presents a comprehensive evaluation of geosites in Bakel, Senegal, integrating geological, cultural, and socio-economic perspectives. The study is relevant to geoheritage conservation and geotourism development, which are emerging interdisciplinary research areas. The work is generally informative and grounded in field observations and literature.

However, the manuscript requires moderate revision to improve clarity, methodological justification, language quality, and scientific depth.

#### Content and Originality

The topic is relevant and timely, particularly in the context of sustainable development and geopark initiatives.

The study contributes regional originality, as Bakel geosites are not widely documented.

Integration of anthropogenic and hydrological geosites is a strength.

The manuscript successfully connects geology with cultural heritage and tourism potential.

Concerns:

The novelty is somewhat limited because the methodology is adapted from existing frameworks (e.g., Brilha, Lima et al.) without significant modification.

The discussion lacks deep critical analysis or comparison with global case studies.

The concept of geopark development is mentioned but not sufficiently developed or critically evaluated.

#### Technical Quality

The methodology (quantitative scoring of geosites) is appropriate and clearly explained (pp. 6–7).

Use of multi-criteria evaluation (scientific, cultural, ecological, aesthetic, economic) is a strength.

Tables (e.g., Table 1, p. 8) and figures support the findings.

Concerns:

The scoring system lacks justification (why equal intervals? why weight scientific value twice?).

No statistical validation or sensitivity analysis is provided.

Some interpretations (e.g., "international importance" or "exceptional value") appear subjective and not supported by measurable criteria.

Limited use of GIS or spatial analysis tools, which could strengthen the study.

**REVIEWER'S REPORT****Language and Presentation**

The manuscript is generally understandable but contains frequent grammatical and stylistic issues.

Examples:

Repetition of phrases (e.g., "The highest score... followed by..." appears multiple times).

Awkward sentence constructions and inconsistent tense usage.

Minor typographical errors (e.g., missing spaces, inconsistent citation formatting).

Recommendation:

Requires professional English language editing.

Improve conciseness and avoid redundancy.

**Structure and Organization**

The manuscript follows a logical structure: Introduction → Study Area → Methodology → Results → Discussion → Conclusion.

Figures and tables are relevant and well placed (e.g., maps on pp. 2, 5, 8).

Concerns:

The Introduction is overly descriptive and could be more focused on research gaps.

The Discussion section is relatively weak, mostly repeating results rather than critically analyzing them.

The Conclusion is lengthy and repetitive, with limited new insights.

Some sections (e.g., geological descriptions) are too detailed and could be condensed.

**References and Citations**

The manuscript includes a good number of references, including recent studies.

Citations are relevant to geoheritage and geotourism literature.

Concerns:

Some references are grey literature (theses, reports)—acceptable but should be balanced with more peer-reviewed sources.

Citation formatting is inconsistent (e.g., punctuation, DOI formatting).

Limited citation of recent global geopark studies.

**Overall Recommendation**

The manuscript has good potential but requires minor revision to meet publication standards.

Strengths:

Relevant topic

Good field-based data

Interdisciplinary approach

Weaknesses:

Language issues

Limited methodological rigor

Weak discussion and critical analysis

**Final Decision**

Minor Revision