

Paper: “Dynamique Saisonnière de *Nedotepa curta* (Homoptera, Cicadellidae) et *Proutista fritillaris* (Homoptera, Derbidae), Potentiels Vecteurs du Phytoplasme de la Maladie du Jaunissement Mortel du Cocotier de Grand-Lahou (Côte d’Ivoire)”

Submitted: 16 October 2021

Accepted: 25 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Beugré N'djiha Isabelle

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p351](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n27p351)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kadio Ekien A. A. Bertille

Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly (UPGC), Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Mpika Joseph

Université Marien Ngouabi, 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: MPIKA Joseph	
University/Country: Université Marien Ngouabi/ Congo	
Date Manuscript Received: 25/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/11/2021
Manuscript Title: Dynamique saisonnière de <i>Nedotepa curta</i> (Homoptera, Cicadellidae) et <i>Proutista fritillaris</i> (Homoptera, Derbidae), potentiels vecteurs du phytoplasme de la maladie du jaunissement mortel du cocotier de Grand-Lahou (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1092/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
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.	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)</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.	3
<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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): comments are written in the manuscript

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: KADIO Ekien A. A. Bertille	
University/Country: Université Peleforo Gon Coulibaly (UPGC) / Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/11/2021
Manuscript Title: Seasonal dynamics of <i>Nedotepacurta</i> (Homoptera, Cicadellidae) and <i>Proutista fritillaris</i> (Homoptera, Derbidae), potentials vectors of the phytoplasma of the coconut lethal yellowing of Grand-Lahou (Côte d'Ivoire)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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
The title is clear and in line with the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The summary clearly presents the methodology and the results, but the objective of the work is not clearly defined	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The article is well written with fewer grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The method is clearly written and understandable	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are clear and contain fewer errors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is supported by the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are appropriate but contain few errors	

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):

The document is well written but the objectives must be clearly defined.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The article is well written and can be published after a few minors revision.