

Paper: “Comparative Effects of Some Botanical Extracts and Chemicals in Controlling the Red Spider Mite *Tetranychus evansi* Baker & Pritchard on Solanaceous Crops”

Submitted: 08 July 2022

Accepted: 12 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Md. Ariful Islam

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p101

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maximenne Amontcha, Université d’Abomey-Calavi

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Adéréwa A. M. AMONTCHA YABI	
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/04/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/05/2022
Manuscript Title: Diversité floristique et comparaison de l'estimation du stock de carbone par trois équations allométriques dans la forêt naturelle de la Mondah	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12.05.2022.	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé est mal structuré et contient des détails sans pertinence pour un résumé.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Des défauts de suite logique entre des idées ont été soulignés dans le document	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Les raisons justificatives du choix des sites prospectés dans le cadre de l'étude n'ont pas été présentées	
Les protocoles statistiques utilisés dans le calcul de la biomasse aérienne n'ont pas été expliqués	
La méthode de détermination de l'équation allométrique la plus approprié n'a pas non plus été présentée	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Des aspects de la démarche méthodologique sont ressortis dans la partie résultat, ce qui ne devrait pas être le cas	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
La conclusion est exagérément longue et présente la problématique du sujet, ce qui ne devait pas être le cas	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: