

**Paper: “Effets Insecticide et Insectifuge des Huiles Essentielles de Cinq Plantes Aromatiques Sur la Bruche de Haricot Cultivé en République du Congo”**

**Submitted: 10 October 2022**

**Accepted: 17 February 2023**

**Published: 28 February 2023**

Corresponding Author: Joseph Mpika

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p294](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n6p294)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Traore Issouf  
Institut Pasteur de Côte d’Ivoire

Reviewer 2: Maiwore Justine  
Université de Maroua, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Maroua, Cameroun

# 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: Pr MAIWORE Justine	
University/Country: Cameroon	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/01/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/01/2023
Manuscript Title: Effets insecticide et insectifuge des huiles essentielles de cinq plantes aromatiques sur la bruche de haricot cultivé en République du Congo	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1085/22	
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/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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<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):**

This manuscript is very interesting with a good methodology that permitted to obtain dense and interesting results. However, the researcher should use the good tense used to narrate the study in Materials and Methods.

**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: TRAORE Issouf	
University/Country: Institut Pasteur de Côte d'Ivoire	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/01/2023
Manuscript Title: <b>Effets insecticide et insectifuge des huiles essentielles de cinq plantes aromatiques sur la bruche de haricot cultivé en République du Congo</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The title is quite precise and in line with the content of the manuscript.)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The objective of the study, the methods and the results appear well in the abstract. Just a few sentences to be rephrased for the reader's understanding)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The manuscript contains a few spelling and grammatical errors which will make it easier to read and understand.)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The method of the study is rigorous and sufficiently detailed for the reader to understand)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The results generated are important and meet the objective set by the author. However, some errors in the reporting of values and units of measurement from tables and graphs to the text are to be noted. Similarly, the comments (sentence style) of the graphs and tables should be reviewed for the readers' understanding.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(The conclusions drawn by the author are correct and in line with the objective of the study. However, the author could avoid unnecessary details (repetition of values) in a conclusion)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(The references cited are listed and appropriate for the purpose of this study, just a few typos in names or publication dates that the author can easily grant)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Congratulations on this great production. The results are quite relevant and interesting for the control of A. obtectus. Thus, they deserve to be shared with the scientific community. However, the manuscript contains some imperfections that should be corrected for a better understanding. The comments on the tables and figures (results) should be taken into account in the style and rules of scientific writing. Also, the author should make sure that the values presented in the tables and figures are consistent with the text.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The work presented in this manuscript is of great interest to both the agricultural and scientific community. The methodology was rigorous enough to obtain relevant results. The literature review is sufficiently comprehensive. In view of these assets, this work should be shared with the scientific community. However, this manuscript suffers from a problem of redaction at the level of the commentary of the results, which could make it difficult for the reader to understand. Taking into account the comments made in the manuscript could remedy this shortcoming.

Thank you again for involving me in this evaluation.