

Manuscript: “**Coffee Berry Borer, Hypothenemus Hampei Ferr.: Cultural Control and In Vitro Effects of Kernel Extracts of Azadirachta indica A. Juss. and Thevetia peruviana (Pers.) Schum**”

Submitted: 12 January 2021

Accepted: 10 August 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Manga Essouma François

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p12

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Devang Upadhyay, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke

Reviewer 3: Adou Bini Yao Christophe, CNRA, Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Devang Upadhyay	Email:
University/Country: The University of North Carolina at Pembroke	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/15/2021
Manuscript Title: Coffee berry borer, <i>Hypothenemus hampei</i> Ferrari: Cultural control and in vitro effects of kernel extracts of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss. and <i>Thevetia peruviana</i> (Pers.) Schum.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02.02.2021 (1)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Title reflects adequate amount of information about the conducted research, as well as all scientific names have been demonstrated scientifically</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Abstracts provides sufficient quantity of information compressively about objects, methods, and results. The object along with the purpose of the study is very</i>	

<i>practical and significant and trying to solve the ongoing issue of coffee production in Cameroon. The approach of the study to control crop pests with plant extracts is very interesting and innovative. Methods have been explained clearly with formulas and statistical techniques. Results have been discussed in depth.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are few critical spelling mistakes that need to be corrected, for example. Chlorpyrifosethyl should be chlorpyrifosethyl. Sentences have been construed scientifically. Just need one more proofreading.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Authors have mentioned study sites and hunting and breeding process in detailed. Manufacture of the artisanal trap for hunting bark beetles was very unique and interesting method. Formulas have been provided clearly for results determination. In vitro assessment of the insecticidal activity of plant extracts on pests were novel techniques and have been explained thoroughly using statistical methods.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Very impressed with the results and discussion parts. The outcomes have been demonstrated graphically and statistically significantly with depth justification of the effects of extracts on pests' mortality rates.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Authors have emphasized on benefits/application of this study as well as future required investigation/objects satisfactory.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Enough references have been cited to support this study, proper formatted according to journal requirement. Recent reports are also included</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Remarkable approach of the study. Just need one more proof reading especially correcting spelling mistakes. Statistical methods have been used significantly throughout the discussion part and graphical demonstrations.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Adou Bini Yao Christophe	Email:
University/Country: CNRA/Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/07/2021
Manuscript Title: Coffee berry borer, <i>Hypothenemus hampei</i> Ferrari: Cultural control and in vitro effects of kernel extracts of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss. and <i>Thevetia peruviana</i> (Pers.) Schum	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 02.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Les noms scientifiques ne sont pas harmonisés (<i>Hypothenemus hampei</i>, Ferrari, <i>Azadirachta indica</i> A. Juss, <i>Thevetia peruviana</i> (Pers.) Schum) ; • En Anglais, contrairement au français, les mots des titres, sauf les déterminants, les adverbes et les propositions, doivent être en majuscule. 	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

-	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
-	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Méthodologie quelque fois confondue aux résultats et méthodes • Phrases trop longues et confuses 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
-	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
-	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pas d'harmonisation au niveau des noms des co-auteurs et des sources de publication. • Je conseille, pour une question d'harmonie et de précision, d'écrire les noms des revues en entier. 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Beaucoup de phrases sont trop longues et confuses. Veuillez les rendre plus simples et plus compréhensibles.