



Paper: “Feeding on Exudates and Leaves of Cassava Cultivars with Varying Cyanogenic Potentials: Implications for the Biology of Typhlodromalus aripo, a Key Biocontrol Agent of Cassava Green Mite in Africa”

Submitted: 18 September 2025

Accepted: 20 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Nazer Famah Sourassou

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n30p65

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Darejan Margalitashvili
Tbilisi State University (TSU), Georgia

Reviewer 2: Ousmane Ndiaye
ENSA/Université Iba Der Thiam de Thies, Senegal

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is clear and adapted to the topic developed in the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

the Abstract shows the potential of cultivars in offering the conditions for the *Typhlodromalus aripo* to develop outside the prey. This opportunity is so important for the pest biological control.

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

I did not found mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the methods are cle

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

the methods are clear and involve many references.

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

the conclusion is synthetic regarding the objective .

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references needs to be complete

41. Yaninek, S., Hanna, R. (2003 or 2005)

Some refernces are not listed

36. Splittstoesser and Pereira, 1987

24. Konstantinos Samaras, 2021

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]

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):

the information is important for biological control.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title of the article -, Feeding on exudates and leaves of cassava cultivars with varying cyanogenic Potentials: Implications for the Biology of Typhlodromalus aripo, a key biocontrol agent of cassava green mite in Africa''- is clear and reflects the content of the work.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents the research object (the predatory mite Typhlodromalus aripo), the research methods, and the research results, which emphasize the effectiveness of the study.

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

The text is well written, with a scientific style, clear structure, and logical sequence.

The article has no grammatical or spelling errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The research methods are based on laboratory experiments. The article describes the course of the experiment clearly and in detail.

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

The main part of the work is completely clear and understandable.

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

The conclusion of the article follows logically from the content and clearly reflects the final results of the experiment.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The authors have used a fairly diverse set of literature sources (41 works), which are fully consistent with the content of the article.

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]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study was conducted under laboratory conditions. It would be desirable to include in the discussion section an idea of how these results could be replicated under natural conditions (farm or field environments). This would enhance the practical relevance of the study for biological control programs.

It is also commendable that the authors studied three mite strains, but it would be desirable to include more genotypes with different cyanogenic levels in future studies. This would strengthen the general conclusions and allow for an expansion of the model.
