

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95131
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study between the topographic method (classical) and photogrammetric method (by drone) for the monitoring and data acquisition of mining works: case of the SOMAïR uranium mine (Arlit, North Niger)
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community. It gives field experimental results for the 2 acquisition methods in this uranium mine, relevant also for other mining operations. The methodology is appropriate. The title of the article is found suitable. The abstract of the article comprehensive. Mainly subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate, well divided and with good overview. However, it is proposed that Discussion should be an independent Chapter IV.</p> <p>The manuscript is in general scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent (older references may still be of scientific value, too). There are several remarks from this reviewer in the manuscript, and improvements in style and form must be done. The structure is too loose, capital letters in ordinary sentences must be changed to small letters, 'pp.' ahead of page references must be removed etc. As far as possible, page references must be given, also assessed from Internet publications. Where French references (1 case in this manuscript) are used, add <i>(in French)</i> at the end of the reference.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The US English applied is suitable for scholarly communications. However, 2 figures must be changed (figs. 2 and 9) with respect to language, from French into English.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs a <b>carefully minor to moderate revision</b>, as pointed out in Review comments and remarks in the manuscript.</p>	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karl-Jan Erstad
Department, University & Country	Consultative Agronomists, Norway