

Paper: “Controle Des Maladies De La Tomate (Solanum Lycopersicum L.) En Culture Avec Trois Extraits De Plantes A Daloa (Cote D’ivoire)”

Submitted: 24 November 2021

Accepted: 09 February 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Yah N'guettia Marie

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p111](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p111)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Toualy Marie-Noël Yeyeh
University Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Seka Koutoua
Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 3: 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: TOUALY Marie-Noël Yeyeh	
University/Country: University NANGUI ABROUGOUA / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 30 th March 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 th April 2022
Manuscript Title: Control of tomato (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) diseases with three plant extracts in Daloa (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.10.2021	
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>
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Corrections are inside the manuscript	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Informations about correction are inside the manuscript Correction are colored in green and questions that needed corrections or modifications are colored in yellow. It is the same for all the manuscript</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<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>(Please insert your comments) some results contained errors The correction of those errors are inside the manuscripts</i>	
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.	4
<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	YES
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: SEKA Koutoua	
University/Country: Université Nangui Abrogoua	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/03/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Contrôle des maladies sur la tomate (<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L.) en culture avec des extraits végétaux	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1043/21	
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.	3

<i>The title must be clear</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The objective of the study is not included in the abstract.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are many grammatical errors and spelling mistake through the manuscript</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Method section must be improved. Details are needed.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Result section must be improved by indicating the main results of the study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions are accurate.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

This is a good paper but method and result section need to be improved by giving more details. There are many grammatical errors and spelling mistake indicated directly on the paper. Authors should correct them.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This is a good paper but method and result sections need more details. Editors could accept the paper with minor revision.