

Paper: “Résistance de la Tique Invasive Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus à la Nouvelle Gamme d’Acaricides Distribués en Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 12 January 2023

Accepted: 27 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

Corresponding Author: Boka Marcel

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n18p284

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edith Mondedji
Université de Lomé, Togo

Reviewer 2: Adehan Safiou-Bienvenu
Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin (INRAB), Cotonou, Bénin

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: 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!

Date Manuscript Received: February 7th, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: February 22nd, 2023
Manuscript Title: Résistance de la tique invasive <i>Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus</i> à la nouvelle gamme d'acaricides distribués en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0154/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Le titre est clair et en adéquation avec le contenu du manuscrit.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>Le résumé n'est pas rédigé dans la norme. Il n'a pas respecté l'ordre de présentation : objectifs, méthodes et résultats. Les remarques et propositions sont faites en mode suivi de modifications dans le fichier.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Les remarques et propositions sont faites en mode suivi de modifications dans le fichier. L'utilisation du mot « spécialité » paraît inappropriée ici.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Il manque des informations pour bien comprendre la méthodologie. La souche sensible utilisée pour déterminer la sensibilité ou la résistance de la tique <i>Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus</i> n'est pas de la même espèce. Le nombre exact de femelles gorgées collecté et celui de larves testées ne figurent pas dans le manuscrit.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>Les résultats obtenus ne sont pas bien décrits. Le Tableau II et les figures 2, 3 et 4 ne sont même pas décrits dans le texte.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Il manque la conclusion par rapport au premier objectif (répertoire des acaricides).</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Les références bibliographiques sont appropriées ; mais la forme est à revoir.</i>	

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):

La souche sensible de tique utilisée (*Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) geigy*) n'est pas de la même espèce que celle testée (*R. (B.) microplus*). **Justifiez l'utilisation de cette souche sensible** afin de pouvoir faire une révision majeure du manuscrit. Sinon, le papier sera rejeté. Revoir aussi la technique de rédaction d'article.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

C'est un bon travail qui a été effectué, mais il manque certains détails (certaines informations à compléter). Les remarques et suggestions aux auteurs se trouvent dans le manuscrit en mode suivi de modification.

Si la souche sensible de tique utilisée (*Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) geigy*) n'est pas justifiée, le manuscrit sera rejeté. Normalement la souche sensible et les individus testés devraient appartenir à la même espèce pour une bonne comparaison. Sauf s'il y a une particularité à signaler.

L'article serait publié sans l'évaluation des pairs. J'ai vu un pdf sur le net. Qu'en est-il s'il vous plait ?

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: ADEHAN Safiou Bienvenu	
University/Country: Republic of Benin	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/02/2023
Manuscript Title: Résistance de la tique invasive <i>Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus</i> à la nouvelle gamme d'acaricides distribués en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20. 54.01.2023	
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.	04

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le titre du manuscrit est assez clair mais quand on parle de résistance, c'est Toujours par rapport à quelque chose. C'est donc la raison pour laquelle je suggère d'ajouter « par rapport » pour dire « résistance par rapport à la nouvelle gamme d'acaricides »	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Le résumé est assez bien conçu et présente les différentes parties à savoir : un objectif, une méthodologie et des résultats. Mis à part quelques coquilles relevées, il est acceptable et recevable mais améliorer l'abstract en fonction des corrections apportées au résumé	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Très peu de fautes de grammaire et d'orthographe dans le manuscrit	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Quelques précisions restent à apporter à la méthodologie utilisée à savoir donner plus de détails concernant le processus de mise en ponte des femelles gorgées et les différentes dilutions utilisées pour le LPT	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Résultats bien exprimés et bien présentés	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
ok	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	03
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
ok	

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):

Toutes recommandations et suggestions ont été déjà faites lors de l'évaluation et dans le manuscrit lui-même. Leur prise en compte pourrait améliorer la qualité du travail présenté

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: 6 Fevrier 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 Fevrier 2023
Manuscript Title: Résistance de la tique invasive <i>Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus</i> à la nouvelle gamme d'acaricides distribués en Côte d'Ivoire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0154/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No NO	
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
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	YES
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE CORRECTIONS IN THE ABSTRACT	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	YES
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	YES
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	NO
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE CORRECTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPT	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	NO
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE CORRECTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPT	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	YES
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE CORRECTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPT	

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):

TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE CORRECTIONS IN THE MANUSCRIPT

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

RAS