

Paper: “Effectiveness of Neem Oil and Jatropha Oil in Controlling Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E Smith) on Maize in the Republic of Chad”

Submitted: 10 March 2022

Accepted: 07 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Mbaidiro Taambaijim'd Josué

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p223](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p223)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Famah Sourassou Nazer
Universidade de Sao Paulo, Brazil

Reviewer 2: Colina Navarrete Eduardo
Universidad Tecnica de Babahoyo, Ecuador

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 11-08-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 28-08-2022
Manuscript Title: Effectiveness of Neem oil and Jatropha oil in controlling Spodoptera frugiperda (J.E Smith) on maize in the Republic of Chad	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 56.03.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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.	5
<i>The title is in accordance with what is indicated in the text by the authors</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>Although it must specify a couple of aspects related to the methodology used, in general it fulfills what was requested</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>In the statistical analysis paragraph there is another type of letter and its size. There are a couple of graphs that do not fit within the assigned sheet size and finally there are paragraphs in which the number of lines allowed in technical writing passes</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology used is well detailed in the text</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>In general, the results show information according to what is stated in the objectives, and that will serve for later work. However, an analysis of the correlation between the damage caused and the time of application of the products should be included.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The discussion has very long paragraphs, which go against technical writing standards. The conclusions provided indicate promising results, however, it must be compared between times of application and see its relationship with the damage. The summary meets the standards.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>In general, the references meet the parameters requested by the journal and contribute knowledge to the defense of the article. However, the number of citations older than 10 years exceeds the value given in the price index (30%), so some citations should be updated.</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):

Review the document in a detailed and general way so that they make the requested changes. Congratulations, good work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr Famah Sourassou Nazer	
University/Country: Togo	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 Sep 2022
Manuscript Title: Effectiveness of Neem oil and Jatropha oil in controlling <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> (J.E Smith) on maize in the Republic of Chad	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 56.03.2022	
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.	4.5

Very clear and concise title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract is consistent with the results of the study	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Well written paper in good English	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology is clearly presented	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are clear, however; I am really concerned about how the authors determine the yield loss: My comment in this regard is mentioned in the paper: This needs more explanation and the authors must address the comments U2 and U3 in the manuscript to ensure a good estimation of yield loss	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Supports the content	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
Appropriate references	

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):

Please, see the text for the comments