



Paper: “Bioinsecticide effect of *Metarhizium anisopliae* on termite pests *Microtermes lepidus* and *Psammotermes hybostoma*, in the laboratory”

Submitted: 04 April 2025

Accepted: 14 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Arfang Mafoudji Sonko

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n15p42

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Magda Davitashvili
Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Dionysis Vourtsis
University of West Attica, Athens, Greece

Reviewer 3: Belamalem Souad
Laboratoire de Génétique et Biométrie, Faculté des Sciences, Université Ibn Tofail, Maroc

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Magda Davitashvili	
University/Country: Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 12.04.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.04.2025
Manuscript Title: Bioinsecticide effect of <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> on termite pests <i>Microtermes lepidus</i> and <i>Psammotermes hybostoma</i> in the laboratory	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0453/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: I agree.	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: I approve.	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is reflecting the content of the paper in a clear and attractive way.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract is clear and correctly written. It contains all the important elements of the paper. It presents objects and results in a clear way.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> It would be nice if the author could reconsider the spelling issues.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study methods are modern and appropriate. Methods are acceptable, reliable with sufficient information. They give the author of the article opportunity to achieve the set goals and objectives.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The results are presented in a clear and didactical way and contain sufficient data.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. The submitted article is relevant and meets the requirements of scientific articles. The article deserves publication.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The used bibliography is actualized, sufficient and well qualified. The list of references is comprehensive.	

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Dionysios Vourtsis	
University/Country: University of West Attica / Athens / Greece	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/05/2025
Manuscript Title: Bioinsecticide effect of <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> on termite pests <i>Microtermes lepidus</i> and <i>Psammotermes hybostoma</i> in the laboratory	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0453/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. Yes	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>Is it better to name Summary as Abstract instead?</i> <i>The results should be better to highlight which is the optimal concentration to use!</i> <i>It could be an idea for discussion on how this methodology (termites infestation in the laboratory) could be implemented on the crops and in real life!</i>	3
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>Only few errors. First paragraph of Introduction: While maybe should be replaced by Nevertheless?</i>	
<i>3.1., 3.2., 3.3., 3.4: individuals or termites?</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>2.2. Preparation of the fungal solution: From where does these 2 formulas for conidia have been obtained?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Yes, but it could be an idea for discussion how these results could be implemented on the crops in real life!</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, but which is the best dose and the most beneficial one? 1 g/l or 1.5 g/l?</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	YES
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Belamalem Souad	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 30/04/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/05/2025
Manuscript Title: Bioinsecticide effect of <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> on termite pests <i>Microtermes lepidus</i> and <i>Psammotermes hybostoma</i> in the laboratory	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0453/25	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article The title reflects the aim of the study	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
The abstract is brief, it usually presents the main parts of the article	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The abstract is brief, it usually presents the main parts of the article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5

The methodology of this work is clear; compressive, it brings a lot of information	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear, sensitive and responsive to scientific norms.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
for the conclusion to be redone, it is necessary to conclude by putting recommendations and perspectives	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
the references respect the standards of the journal	