

Manuscript: “**Effets de l’huile de Thevetia et de Top bio sur les prédateurs en culture cotonnière biologique à Gobé au Centre du Bénin**”

Submitted: 12 October 2020

Accepted: 12 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Saturnin Azonkpin

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p284](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p284)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Esther Pegalepo,
Côte d’Ivoire

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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!

Reviewer Name:		
University/Country:		
Date Manuscript Received: 14/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 28/10/2020	
Manuscript Title:	Effets de l'huile de <i>Thevetia</i> et de Top bio sur les prédateurs en culture cotonnière biologique au Centre du Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	10102/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	Yes/No	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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The name of the region in Benin where the study was conducted has to be included in the title</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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Methodology is clear but the majority of the data was collected only on one year. One year study is not sufficient to confirm the efficacy of the biopesticides used. At least 2 years of data collection are important to confirm the efficacy of the biopesticide on the crop pest, because of the environmental parameters that can affect the efficacy of the biopesticides during the study)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(The body of the paper should have at least the results of 2 years studies)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The name of the journal or review should be fully written ; no abbreviation)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

Data collection of at least 2 years of the number of “Coccinelles”; “Chrysopes”; “Phonoctonus”, “Araignées” and “mante religieuse” should be insert in the article to confirm or not the efficacy of the biospesticide used during this study.