ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial teamis a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 04/10/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 07/10/2016
Manuscript Title: **PREVALENCE DE LA MALADIE DU DEPERISSEMENT DE L'ANANAS (WILT) ET PERCEPTION DES PRODUCTEURS AU BENIN**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1076/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-lesspoint rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
Deviance résiduelle is not the appropriate statistical French word, check	
Correct Huges by (Hughes) in Huges et Samita 1998	
Sether et Hu 2002 exist in the form a and b in the reference but in the text only Sether et Hu 2002 are cited.	
Carter 1945b exist in the text and in the reference but in only one form and should be Carter 1945	

without b	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**3**
Translate the following words in the tables and put also as footnotes their explanations (Df, Deviance, Resid Df, Resid Dev, Estimate, Std, Error, Z-value, SE, RRR, Intercept, IC, Pr, Coeff.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	*3*
Some references are too old (Illingwort 1931, Carter 1945b) *Some references cited in the text are lacking in the references (Carter et Collins 1967; Nakazawa, 2014; Virasakdi 2012; Venables et Ripley 2002)* *Some references cited in the references are lacking in the text (Cooke 2006; Adjanohoun et Igué...)*	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the introduction part, specify pineapple yield in Benin and the important production zones in Benin and say why did you focus your study on 5 communes?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: