

Paper: “Survey of the Use of Phytosanitary Products in Vegetable Crops in the District of Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 17 November 2022

Accepted: 13 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Coulibaly Anne Edwige

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p114](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p114)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Magdalena Vaverkova
Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic

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: Magdalena Daria Vaverková	
University/Country: Mendel University in Brno, Czech Republic	
Date Manuscript Received: 17.03.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 20.03.2023
Manuscript Title: ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF PHYTOSANITARY PRODUCTS IN VEGETABLE CROPS IN THE DISTRICT OF ABIDJAN, CÔTE D'IVOIRE	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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/No	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

I would suggest changing the title from analysis to survey.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract presents objects, methods and results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Yes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Yes.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
Yes.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
Yes.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
References are too old. Authors should follow the most recent publications. It would help to write an appropriate Introduction showing the state of art in a given topic.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This topic for this paper is interesting and up to date.

Although the Abstract and Methods part are acceptable the authors did not present a research question. What is the main question addressed by the research? Was there a research hypothesis? This should be supplemented.

References are too old. Authors should follow the most recent publications. It would help to write an appropriate Introduction showing the state of art in a given topic.

Already the first sentence in the Introduction raises the suspicion that the data is out of date:

Over the past two decades, following rapid urbanization and high economic concentration, agriculture has developed significantly in urban and peri-urban areas of West Africa (Koffi et al. 2012).

Also in the Discussion, authors should focus on more recent literature (not older than 5 years). This will allow you to present the problem in the current state.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: