



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Usage de pesticides interdits et non homologués en maraîchage périurbain à Kinshasa : cas de Kimwenza et Ndjili Cecomaf”

Submitted: 20 March 2026

Accepted: 10 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Clément Munganga Kilingwa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n18p194

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kimanda Asha Mireille
Université de Kinshasa, RDC

Reviewer 2: Demba Diakhate
Mechanization specialist at ISRA, Senegal

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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!

Reviewer Name: Dr Demba DIAKHATE	
University/Country: SENEGAL	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/04/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 20/04/2026
Manuscript Title: Prévalence et facteurs déterminants de l'usage des pesticides interdits en agriculture maraîchère à Kinshasa : cas des sites de Kimwenza et Ndjili Cecomaf	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>Yes, the abstract presents objectives, methods and results</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The grammatical style used by these authors are corrects and contains very few errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The majority of the specific objectives listed were addressed in the materials and methods section, but the specific objective related to formulating recommendations for safe management and use of pesticides at the study sites was not addressed. This is why this section is incomplete.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results presented are clear but the authors must redo the numbering of the figures. There are errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion does not take into account all of the results obtained and the discussions. It should be strengthened by the authors to give it more weight.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>There are missing and extra references in the reference list. The authors must correct these omissions.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The entire body of the article needs to be improved. Regarding the general objective of the topic, it should be reduced to a single general objective instead of two. As for the the specific objectives, there are 4; this should be limited to two and a maximum of three. In the materials and methods section, the paragraph numbering must be reviewed, and you must also identify the materials and methods that will allow you to address specific objective 4 of your article (formulation of recommendations for safe management and use of pesticides). The numbering of figures in the results section, you must compare your results with previous findings from the literature in order to confirm or refute them etc...

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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!

Reviewer Name: KIMANDA ASHA MIREILLE	
University/Country: Université de Kinshasa /RDC	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/04/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/04/2026
Manuscript Title: Prévalence et facteurs déterminants de l'usage des pesticides interdits en agriculture maraîchère à Kinshasa : cas des sites de Kimwenza et Ndjili Cecomaf	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0415/26	
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.

	<i>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a une partie du titre qui n'est pas prise en compte par les résultats (voir les suggestions)	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a une redondance et le style est classique, propre à un mémoire. La synthèse les rendrait très pertinents	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les éléments sur lesquels ces deux parties s'appuient ne sont pas bien ressortis dans les résultats	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Tout est à refaire	

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):

De manière Générale, le travail est très intéressant et révélateur. Néanmoins, il y a quelques coquilles.

- C'est important de présenter la (les) question(s) de recherche
- Avoir un esprit de synthèse
- Revoir la mise en forme des textes et des titres
- En voyant la section sur les variables retenue, j'ai cru que la recherche ferait appelle aux analyses économétriques, ce qui n'est pas le cas et même leurs influences sur l'utilisation de ces produits n'est pas clairement démontrée.
- L'objectif 3 n'a pas des résultats qui lui conviennent
- Enlever "facteurs déterminants" dans le titre pour qu'il ait de l'harmonie avec le texte, car nulle part le manuscrit ne montre leur influence sur l'utilisation des produits phytosanitaires.
- Trop des mots clés. Choisissez en 5 seulement.
- Le résumé en anglaise doit être adapté après correction du résumé en français.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: