

Manuscript: “**Effet Bio-Insecticide De L’huile Essentielle Et De La Poudre De Chenopodium Ambrosioides L. Sur Les Imagos De Bruches De Haricots En Stockage**”

Submitted: 13 February 2021

Accepted: 27 May 2021

Published: 31 July 2021

Corresponding Author: Mpika Joseph

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n25p267

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lepengue Nicaise, USTM, Gabon

Reviewer 2: Jean de Dieu Mangambu, University of Bukavu, Congo

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: LEPENGUE NICAISE	
University/Country: USTM GABON	
Date Manuscript Received: 21 AVRIL	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 AVRIL
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 92. 02. 2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

CONTINUE

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: Mangambu Mokoso JD	
University/Country: RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/05/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 6/05/2021
Manuscript Title: Effet bio-insecticide de l'huile essentielle et de la poudre de la partie terminale de <i>Chenopodium ambrosioides</i> L. sur les imagos de bruches de haricots, <i>Acanthoscelides obtectus</i> . Say (Coleoptera, Bruchidea) en stockage in vitro.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 95.02.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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>	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2,5/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est tres long	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	3,5/5

results.	
<i>(Please insert your comments) c'est bon, mais tres long</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Un bon style	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3,75/
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2/5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Pas de recommendation	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4/7
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):