

Paper: “Comparative Study of Two Monoterpenes Effect on Rhipicephalus microplus Tick”

Submitted: 12 June 2023

Accepted: 04 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Anass Coulibaly

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p34](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n24p34)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Arun N. Ghosh
West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 2: Titilayo Olotu
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Erick Mibei
University of Kabianga, Kericho, Kenya

Reviewer 4: Amal Talib Al Sa'ady
Babylon University, Iraq

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes.

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

One typos on Page -3. Formula : X. Should be Formula:

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes.

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

Yes. Tables are OK. Some graphical representation would be great!

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

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Tables are OK. Some graphical representation would be great!

Reviewer R:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

No spelling errors, and the plagiarism level is acceptable. Its needs to be edited using an English editor.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

yes

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

Yes, the conclusion and summary are supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, references are in APA format

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

2

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):

Its needs to be edited using an English editor.

Reviewer S:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes.

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

Error in Taxonomic spelling of the plant family Ranunculaceae. Please correct.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

1 error found, stated above.

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

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

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):

Good work on important cattle pathogen. Please continue the good work for the cattle industry.

Reviewer U:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

yes

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

no

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

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

1. references citation within the text must be in accordance with the instructions of the journal.
2. Conclusions need to be rewritten and clarify the most important scientific conclusions reached by the current study in a brief scientific manner.
3. The ordering of the references within the list of references must be in accordance with the instructions of the journal.

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

1. Conclusions need to be rewritten and clarify the most important scientific conclusions reached by the current study in a brief scientific manner.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The ordering of the references within the list of references must be in accordance with the instructions of the journal.

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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

5

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):

1. references citation within the text must be in accordance with the instructions of the journal.
2. Conclusions need to be rewritten and clarify the most important scientific conclusions reached by the current study in a brief scientific manner.
3. The ordering of the references within the list of references must be in accordance with the instructions of the journal.

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:	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/07/2023
Manuscript Title: Comparative study of two monoterpenes effect on Rhipicephalus microplus tick	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0653/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes/ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Acaracidal procedures not very clear especially on immersion then incubation for 24 hours. It has to be clear if the Eos are withdrawn then the larvae is incubated without the EOs (or with the Eos). This has to be clear.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Improve on the possible explanation for the difference in efficacy between Thymol and 1.8 cineole. Include in the discussion the difference in structure which could explain the difference in activity. Also consider explaining the reasons to target the two EOs and not any other plant EOs with potential anti tick activities.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<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):

Consider explaining the reasons to target the two EOs and not any other plant EOs with potential anti tick activities. Also the reasons not to include a conventional acaracide as a comparison to the two EOs. You need to be careful not to be questioned why did you not include one of the synthetic acaracides in use currently so as to validate the observed results.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

None