

Manuscript: “**Evaluation De L’utilisation Des Huiles Essentielles De Six Plantes Aromatiques Collectées Au Benin Dans La Lutte Alternative Contre Les Aflatoxins**”

Submitted: 06 October 2021

Accepted: 16 February 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: **Yann ADJOVI**

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n11p207

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kobenan Koffi, Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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; Koffi Christophe KOBENAN	
University/Country: Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 / 11/ 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/12/2021
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de l'utilisation des huiles essentielles de six plantes aromatiques collectées au Benin dans la lutte alternative contre les aflatoxines	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.10.2021	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
NEW TITLE "Evaluation de l'utilisation des huiles essentielles de six plantes aromatiques collectées au Benin dans la lutte alternative contre les aflatoxines"	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Beaucoup trop de fautes!	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert Yl'Aour comments)</i> L'analyse chimique des huiles essentielles est absente...	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La discussion n'a pas été bien rédigée!	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Le travail est intéressant ...malheureusement le document n'a pas été très bien rédigée...il ya beaucoup trop de phrases incompréhensible avec trop de fautes...
La discussion a été mal menée....Réécrivez la partie Discussion svp
Conformez vous à la note aux auteurs!!!!

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: