

Manuscript: “**Utilisation et Gestion des Pesticides dans les Zones Agricoles Urbaines, Périurbaines et Rurales de la Préfecture de Meknès, Maroc**”

Submitted: 26 August 2021

Accepted: 15 September 2021

Published: 30 September 2021

Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Ibrahim

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p94

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Moussa Diarra, Université Jean Lorougnon Guede , Côte D’ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Claude Ahouangninou, Université Nationale d’Agriculture, (UNA)/Bénin

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: Dr DIARRA Moussa	Email:
University/Country: Université Jean Lorougnon GUEDE / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 Août 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 29 Août 2021
Manuscript Title: Utilisation et gestion des pesticides en agriculture dans les zones urbaines, périurbaines et rurales de la Préfecture de Meknès, Maroc	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0934/21	
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.	4

<i>(the title of the manuscript is to review; take into account the one proposed</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The summary does not clearly present the objectives, the material and the methods. and the results are to be reviewed.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Take into account all mistakes and correct them</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>No quite. It does not specify the number of respondents in the urban agricultural zone?, peri-urban? and rural areas? of the Prefecture of Meknes, Morocco</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Results are clear but contain minimal errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions or the summary are not correct. because the conclusion he gives is rather perspectives</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are complete and appropriate. However, a reference is to be reviewed</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article as a whole needs to be reviewed. The author must take into account the title that I proposed for a good understanding. He must take into account all the mistakes and delete all the sentences that I crossed out. He must also resume the conclusion which must hang in the elements detailed in the results and discussion. Because the conclusion as given is rather perspectives

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 26-08-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 02-09-2021
Manuscript Title: Utilisation et gestion des pesticides en agriculture dans les zones urbaines, périurbaines et rurales de la Préfecture de Meknès, Maroc	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 34.09.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Les résultats sont clairs. Cependant ils le seraient encore plus s'ils étaient organisés en sous titre pour faciliter la lecture du document</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: Claude AHOUANGNINOU	
University/Country: Université Nationale d'Agriculture (UNA)/Bénin	
Date Manuscript Received: 27 th August	Date Review Report Submitted: 03 rd September
Manuscript Title: Utilisation et gestion des pesticides dans les zones agricoles urbaines, périurbaines et rurales de la Préfecture de Meknès, Maroc	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

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.	5

<i>Le titre de l'article est clair et en accord avec le contenu.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Utiliser aussi le présent narratif dans le résumé)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Le glyphosate est....la plus consommé. Il faut employer le verbe « utiliser ».</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2.5
<i>Il faut insérer un sous-titre "méthodologie d'étude ". Est-ce que l'échantillonnage est aléatoire simple ? Il existe une stratification et un même poids accordé aux strates.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3.5
<i>Les résultats sont clairs, mais il faudrait mieux les discuter. Insérer les travaux de Ahouangninou et al. (2011 ; 2015) au Bénin, Gbonsou et al. (2020) au Bénin pour mieux étoffer la discussion.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>La conclusion et le résumé de l'étude sont en accord avec le contenu. Ils relatent les résultats principaux de l'étude.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Les références incluses dans l'étude sont appropriées et sont des articles ou rapports d'étude ou de recherche publiés dans des revues ou présentés à des congrès.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *Revoir la méthodologie d'étude, préciser les paramètres déterminés ainsi que les tests statistiques utilisés.*