

Paper: “Sensibilité des Populations D’Aedes Aegypti des Zones Héveicoles de Dabou (Sud de la Côte d’Ivoire) aux Organophosphorés, aux Pyréthriinoïdes et au Bacillus Thuringiensis Israelensis”

Submitted: 16 January 2022

Accepted: 05 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Issouf Traore

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p31](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p31)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lambert kouassi Konan
Institut Pasteur de Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Julie-Anne Tangéna
Felix Houphouët Boigny University of Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, although the addition of the insecticides used would be valuable.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Methodology requires a bit more information regarding the specific test methods that have been used (I assume WHO tube tests), duration of exposure etc.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

My French is not sufficient to comment on language. I find it easy to understand and clear.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes. I have included detailed comments in the attached document.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes. I have included detailed comments in the attached document.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes. However, a bit more discussion regarding its susceptibility status compared to neighbouring areas would be useful. Is it different? Why is it different? What does this mean for future control plans?

I have included detailed comments in the attached document.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please see my attached document for detailed feedback.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 12 juillet 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 juillet 2022
Manuscript Title: Evaluation de la sensibilité des populations d'Aedes aegypti des plantations d'hévéa et des villages environnants à Dabou, au sud de la Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 15051-Article Text-43906-1-4-20220113	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: YES 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 is written in plain language	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

the abstract clearly presents the objectives, materials and results, but the origin of the adult mosquitoes was not clearly defined	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> there are certainly some grammatical and spelling errors that the authors could correct without a great impact on the acceptable content of the work	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> In the section "population and strains of mosquitoes studied", the biological material used has been well described. In the "adulticidal tests" section, the authors state in line 1 and 2 that "the tests were carried out with the different families of insecticides". At line 6; they put that "the samples were exposed to 2 families of insecticides". And the other families listed in line 1?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are well exploited. They are consistent with the title and respond to the questioning of the methodology. The tables and the figure are also well presented, but the authors have not respected the numbers given. For example, they wrote "Table I; Table II" in the text instead of "Table 1; table 2".	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> the conclusion is correct and answers the problem posed in the introduction	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references do not comply with the requirements given in the instructions to authors	

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):

What the study wants to show is the study of the sensitivity of Aedes mosquitoes to certain families of common insecticides. The text does not describe why Dabou was chosen. Why did you choose Dabou and not other localities.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This study is a contribution to the mapping of the sensitivity of disease vector mosquitoes to insecticides initiated in Côte d'Ivoire with a view to implementing selective vector control. She is to be encouraged. The manuscript can be accepted.