

Manuscript: “**Inventaire Et Identification Des Dégâts Des Insectes Infestant Les Plants De Manioc (Manihot Esculenta Crantz) À Deux Et Huit Mois Après Plantation Et Essai De Lutte Biologique Dans La Localité De Daloa (Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 26 January 2021

Accepted: 21 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Rabilou Abdou Mahaman

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p180

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Ir. Mamam S. Toléba

Reviewer 2: Mbo Kacou

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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. Ir. Mamam S. TOLÉBA	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (Bénin).	
Date Manuscript Received: 04.02.22	Date Review Report Submitted: 28.02.22
Manuscript Title: Inventaire et identification des dégâts des insectes infestant les plants de manioc (<i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz) à deux et huit mois après plantation dans la localité de Daloa et essai de lutte biologique.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: --21.02.2022---	
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.	3,5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Revoir les corrections proposées dans la formulation et les dispositions du titre !</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Votre étude est focus LOCAL ; les résultats ne peuvent donc pas être extrapolés niveau continental. Éviter de personnaliser les résultats de travaux scientifiques ! il y a un style réservé à cet effet.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Une lecture silencieuse est nécessaire en vue de redresser certaines phrases dont la clarté n'est pas appréciable. Une erreur qui a été relevée doit être corrigée dans tout le texte et non seulement à l'endroit indiqué !</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Méthodologie acceptable mais peut mieux faire !</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Quelques coquilles dues au manque de concentration sont notées tout au long du texte. Ces genres de coquilles altèrent parfois la compréhension du récit ! Vouloir bien en tenir compte.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Mêmes observations que dans les chapitres précédents.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Bibliographie à relire avec attention. Tenir compte des observations faites également à ce niveau.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

Les Auteurs doivent faire un effort de concentration dans la formulation des idées. Tenir compte des observations de l'Examineur !

Bon courage.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Les Auteurs sont priés de prendre en compte les corrections qui leur sont proposées ; si possible, les améliorer.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Le document peut être accepté sous réserve de reprise et intégration des observations faites par l'Examineur.

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: MBO KACOU	
University/Country: UNIVERSITE FELIX-Houphouet Boigny Cote d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Inventaire et identification des dégâts des insectes infestant les plants de manioc (<i>Manihot esculenta</i> Crantz) à deux et huit mois après plantation dans la localité de Daloa et essai de lutte biologique.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0221/22	
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 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title reflects the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
he summary presents the work done with the methods and results obtained	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
RAS, the French is understandable with a good writing	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Methodes are well explained	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
No errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
RAs	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: