

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129055
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF CLIMATIC PARAMETERS ON THE INCIDENCE OF BLACK POD ROT OF COCOA TREES IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The work allows to identify the climatic factors that influence the incidence of black pod rot in cocoa, which is very important in decision making in the phytosanitary management of the crop and to avoid significant losses. The results obtained in the work are essential for cocoa cultivation and for producers, especially due to the economic and social importance of this agricultural product.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and provides the results of the work in a timely manner. However, the objective of the work is wrong since it mentions "The aim of this study was to determine the impact of the disease in seven localities in the Agnéby-Tiassa region of south-eastern Côte d'Ivoire" but it is evident in the body of the work, the experimental design and the results that the impact of the disease in the localities of the study region is not being measured. In this way, it is evident that the objective is to determine the effect of climatic parameters on the incidence of the disease in the study localities. Therefore, it is suggested that the respective corrections be made by focusing the objective on what was done in the research.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and clearly shows a background, a working hypothesis, an objective, a methodology that includes an appropriate experimental design to reach the objective and the results are presented appropriately and the conclusions thereof. There is no evidence that the symptoms determined correspond to those caused by <i>P. palmivora</i> and these can be confused in the early stages with those of other pathogens such as <i>M. royeri</i> or <i>M. perniciosa</i> . It is evident that the bibliographical citations are poorly done and do not follow the format of the journal, which according to the guide is in numbers in parentheses and the number is assigned according to the appearance of the bibliography and this will finally be seen in the list of references. It is suggested to fix the details of the bibliography.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. Although it uses some recent references, there are many that are not, while in the bibliography there are slightly more recent works that deserve to be cited, such as: - Climate, fruiting and frosty pod rot influence the epidemic intensity of <i>Phytophthora capsici</i> in cacao plantations in Mexico - https://iscrsymposium.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/317-Dr.-Agbeniyi-Poster.pdf - Management of black pod rot in cacao (<i>Theobroma cacao</i> L.): a review	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	The work in general is very good and has a great contribution to the state of the art and to the knowledge of this disease of cacao. The research follows the scientific method, it has a state of the art, a problem, a research question, an objective, a hypothesis, a methodology, an experimental design and the respective results and conclusions. Therefore, it is a robust work. It is evident that the bibliographical citations are poorly done and do not follow the format of the journal, which according to the guide is in numbers in parentheses and the number is assigned according to the appearance of the bibliography and this will finally be seen in the list of references. It is suggested to fix the details of the bibliography. Scientific names in the bibliographic list do not appear in italics as they should. All bibliographic references in the list do not comply with the journal's format.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luz Adriana Pedraza Herrera
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia