



**Paper: “Comparaison des effets des matières actives d'un pesticide homologué et de quelques biopesticides sur *Amrasca biguttula* en culture cotonnière à Banikoara (Bénin)”**

**Submitted: 26 January 2026**

**Accepted: 04 April 2026**

**Published: 30 April 2026**

Corresponding Author: Didolanvi Mèdèssè Luc

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p84

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Zakaria Dieni

Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles (INERA), Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Léon H. Akpatcho

Institut National des Recherches Agricoles du Bénin

Reviewer 3: Soura Banemane

Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Département de Biologie Végétale, Benin

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

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

Titre clair

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

Revoir le résumé et utilisez les mots qui conviennent. c'est quoi un objet?

quel est le dispositif ?

la description du matériel a pris les 1/4 du résumé ce qui est trop.

les résultats ne sont pas bien étayés

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

A revoir

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

dans matériel: précisez la composition des huiles notamment les principes actifs

le dispositif n'est pas clair, des doses qui varient sans explication.

utilisez les expressions idéales pour un essai, on parle de bloc, répétition,.....

si possible mettre le dispositif en image

il manque l'analyse statistique: avec quel outil vous avez analysé

1

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

trop de confusion

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

a revoir

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

a reprendre et uniformisez. utilisez le guide des auteurs

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***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]

2

***Please rate the RESULTS 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!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Revoir le style de rédaction, utilisez les mots agronomique. relire le document en entier.

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

he title has been corrected. Indeed, saying "Comparative effect....." does not convey that the effects of several different products were compared.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

Yes, it is wel presented

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

There are errors in wording and text positioning before figures that are inappropriate.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes, very good

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

Yes, good

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

The discussion was poorly written. It reads more like a results commentary than a discussion.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*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]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*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):**

RAS

-----

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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!***

Date Manuscript Received: 12/02/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/03/2026
Manuscript Title: Effet comparé des matières actives d'un pesticide homologué et de quelques biopesticides sur <i>Amrasca biguttula</i> en culture cotonnière à Banikoara (Bénin)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	3
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b> <i>(Please see comments in the manuscript)</i>	3
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b> <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	4
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b> <i>(Authors are requested to address comments and concerns mentioned in the manuscript)</i>	3
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b> <i>(Authors are requested to improve the result section. Tables may be necessary, at least to present the results of ANOVA.)</i>	2
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	2

*(The discussion section needs a critical revision. Please, explain your results, the implications of your findings which are necessary for drawing appropriate conclusions. )*

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

**4**

*(Some citations need to be edited)*

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**