



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_4855
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity, antifeedant and growth regulating potential of three plant extracts against the desert locust <i>Schistocerca gregaria</i> Forskal (Orthoptera: Acrididae)
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The Latin names should be italicized: Orthoptera (page 1), Acrididae (page 1), Apocynaceae (page 3), Euphorbiaceae (page 3) The first time they appear in the text, the names of species (Jatropha curcas, Azadirachta indica, Solenostemma argel, Pennisetum glaucum ?) must be followed by the names of authors who have described In the section material and methods, clarify: • the drying conditions of the seeds of the plants prior to the oil extraction; • dose of product applied (amount of product applied); • the method of choice of insect pairs used to study "effects on fecundity and egg hatchability"; • the statistical unit in the "Nymphicidal bioassay" test and trial "effects on fecundity and egg hatchability," it would able to know the number of replications in each of these tests Make also the following corrections : • 65-70° C instead of 65-70 °C (page 5) • 150° C instead of 150°C (page 5) Finally, specify the software used to perform the ANOVA In the data analysis section, it is mentioned that each treatment was repeated four times, but it is not clear in the description of the methods used in the first two trials; it also	The latin names have been written in italics, the name of the order and family, however, are usually not italicized. All suggested corrections and changes pointed out by the reviewer were made (see revised version of the MS.)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	appears inconsistent with what is stated in the test 3, you mentioned having applied this test with 3 replications Give the formula that helped make the angular transformation of data The species mentioned <i>Pennisetum typhoidium</i> is may be <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br. Synonym of <i>Pennisetum typhoides</i> (Burm. f.) Stapf & C. E. Hubb In the section Results make the following corrections: • Table 1: Column 6, correct Chi square instead of square • Tables 2, 3, 4 and 5 : letters indicating statistical differences between treatments should be superscript letter • Table 3: put a space between the genus name and species name for <i>S. gregaria</i>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the results section, Tables 4 and 5 must be analyzed in much more detail Limitations of the study must be presented and especially address the question of the influence of the nature of the solvent used for the extraction of oil on the content of phorbol esters and effectiveness of oils; for this read the following reference: Muralidhara R.D., Anitha S., Aravinda A., Karunakar B., and Devanna N. Biopesticidal Properties of Seed, Seed Cake and Oil of <i>Jatropha curcas</i> L. Against the Polyphagous Lepidopteran Pest <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>, 369-382. In N. Carels et al. (eds.), <i>Jatropha, Challenges for a New Energy Crop: Volume 1: 383 Farming, Economics and Biofuel</i>, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-4806-8_21, Springer Science+Business Media New York 2012 English needs to be improved	
---	--	--