

Paper: “First Isolation and Identification of Agriphages in Vegetable Crops in West Africa (Côte d’Ivoire): Potential Uses of Biocontrol in Plants”

Submitted: 20 July 2022

Accepted: 09 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Elise Solange Ngazoa Kakou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Muchelule Yusuf Wanjala
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Namla Djadjiti

Nile University, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Fattma Abody
Hawler Medical University, Erbil, Iraq

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

the title needs to be reviewed e.g the author needs to justify what he means by first first isolation; does it mean that previously in west Africa there were not any other isolations of the similar cases? kindly justify

the title should be reviewed considering also the following

- A concise statement of the main topic and should identify the variables.
- Should be a reflection of the contents of the document.
- Fully explanatory when standing alone

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

An abstract is a brief statement of problem, objectives of the study, study, target population, sampling technique and sample size, instruments, data processing and analysis, key findings and major recommendations. It is the executive summary of the whole document, and it should capture the main theme of each chapter. A good abstract must have a closing remark. considering the above the abstract should be reviewed to incorporate all the above stated since some of them are missing

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes the author should format the document as well as should review some few grammatical and contextual spellings errors in the document for a quality paper

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methodology should be reviewed as follows

1. The research design should be clear - Indicating the type of research, justify the choice of type of research by citing authority
2. Target Population should be reviewed and increased in such kind of the study as well as the unit of observation and unit of analysis should be clearly justified
3. justify the choice of your Sampling frame.
4. There is no clear understanding of the sample size and sampling technique adopted and why???
5. review research instruments used and justify their choice of preference in the study.
6. its not clear how data was processed and analysed in the study

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

the document needs some formatting due to minimal errors

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The study findings should be clearly guided by the methodology as well as the unit of analysis should be based on the research questions or objectives and should capture the study variables, the author should also review the referencing styles used in the study as well as adopting the current citations and evidence in line with the study . The author also should Indicate exactly why and how it is a problem on the agriphages in vegetables. Give information to support this e.g., by use of statistics or evidence. This should be derived from background information to illustrate connectivity.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

should be reviewed adopting current citations

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

review the suggested corrections for quality paper

Reviewer W:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is okay and contains the keywords which adequately described the content and purpose of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents methods and results. However, some materials such as vegetable crops as well as the bacterial strains used in the study are mentioned in the abstract. Also, the abstract is too wordy (lengthy). It should have a maximum of 150 words.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Hence, for improvement of this article, the authors are urged to address these errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods involved in this study are explicit and replicable, as well as they address the underlying purpose of the research.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clearly structured as it includes a constructive discussion in which the importance of the material presented together with the result obtained are discussed and related to other pertinent literature. However, a few typo errors are noticeable.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion clearly wraps up the content of the article and reinforces the aim presented in the body of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Each reference in the list of references includes authors, article title, journal title, date of publication, volume, issue, and location/pagination. However, not all the in-text citations are included in the list. Authors are, therefore, urged to include all the in-text citations to the list of references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a good piece of research and the authors have put in a lot of effort to bring the manuscript to the current level. Although the English language could be edited by expert linguists to improve the standard.

Reviewer X:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and the results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I didn't find any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes in this paper.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly, but to my opinion are explained in more detail.

To my opinion, when standard protocols are used, there is no need for many details in the paper.

Otherwise, authors should clearly explain any changes or adjustments in a standard protocol, and the reasons why these changes or adjustments are done.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes, the conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is appropriate.

The journal name is missing in this reference:

12. Jones, J.B., Vallad, G.E., Iriarte, F.B., Obradović, A., Wernsing, M.H & Jackson, L.E, (2012). Considerations for using bacteriophages for plant disease control, 2: 208–214. doi: 10.4161/bact.23857

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest less details in methods used for the research.

Reviewer Y:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes but I prefer to change it to structural abstract and must be included the conclusions

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes vary few mistake

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes vary clear

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

yes mostly clear and contain vary few mistakes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

yes at the end of the article the conclusions is vary clear and supported by the cotaents

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes it is comprehensive and included a lot of update references

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest to change the body of the abstract to structural divide it to four parts contains the background and methods and results and conclusions .
