



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Plant extracts are becoming attractive nowadays for the control of agricultural insect pests. This work is a further testimony to the efficacy of our botanicals against insect pest infestations. I recommend acceptance of this manuscript after it has majorly be reviewed by the author(s). Page 2 Introduction: Line 10: change banning to ban Line 13: insert , after insecticides; insert , after action Line 15: delete 'as of 1960 and was'; change to 'in the 1960s', Line 18: delete 's' from 'outbreaks' Line 21: There should be comma after the author's name. et. al., should be italicized where ever it appears Line 26: delete 'on'; change to 'in' Line 28: complete the statement with '—alternative is the use of the pheromone, Phenylacetoneitrile— Line 30+: comma after author's name where ever it occurs Page 3 Line 4: delete 'The' Line 14: change 'were' to 'was'; comma after '1959' Line 20: delete 'is' Line 23: delete 'the' Line 26: move (Abo El-Gharet <i>al.</i>, 1996) to the end of the sentence Line 28: change 'illustrating' to 'demonstrating' Line 29: add 's' to 'extract' Line 30: add this after '<i>S. gregaria</i>' "and to determine the efficacy and potentials of using either of these three materials as choice candidates in the control of this insect pest".	We would like to thank the reviewer for his valuable comments and detailed revision of the manuscript. We have made all the suggestions and corrections pointed out by the reviewer (See attached revised version).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Materials and Methods Page 4 Line 18: change 'in large scale' to 'on a large scale' Line 24: comma after 'cleaned' ;delete 'from foreign materials' Line 29: depulped to de-pulped Line 29: delete 'that if left would encourage growth of fungi' add 'in order to disallow fungal growth' Line 31: add 'the' different treatment Page 5 Lines 1-2: this should read: The powder preparation of each plant was used to produce the crude extract in a soxhlet apparatus using 95% hexane. Line 3: change 'removed' to 'evaporated' At what temperature and pressure was this done? Nymphicidal bioassay: What is the quantity of extract used for each spray as well as the duration of the spray on the test insect? Line 17: in the equation/formula: * should be changed to x sign. Line 19: add 'and' after development; remove the comma Line 25: add comma after cage Line 26: add comma after plywood Line 27: (75cm diam., 11cm deep) Line 29: add using a 2mm sized wire mesh; remove (2mm) Page 6 Line 2: delete 'was' Phago-deterent test What informed the use of hexane and not other solvents? Why use 5% extracts and not 10% as used in the previous test? Lines 4-5: delete (neem seeds oil 5% jatrophia seed oil 5% and Agel extract 5%); the statement could read: The antifeedant effects of the extracts at 5% concentration..... Line 6-8: delete from 'There were.....inan experimental cage' add	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10 3rd nymphs were used in each of the tests and replicated 3 times Line 11: delete 'were' Line 21: delete 'The' Line 24: delete 'a' Results Line 29: add comma after respectively Line 30: add comma after 20.70% Page 7 Line 3: add after argel 'which was' 270.98 Are these days really significantly different from one another? (11-17 days). These differences can be couched in another way to describe the moulting period of the treated nymphs. For the anti-feedant effect, i think it will be safer to just indicate that argel induced a less anti-feedant effect compared with neem and jatropa oil. Discussion Page 8 Line 4: change 'for' add 'at'; add 'level' after concentration Line 6: add comma after <i>S. Gregaria</i> Line 11: delete 'the'; add comma after <i>et., al</i> Line 12: delete 'in a laboratory feeding,' Line 13: add after <i>S. Gregaria</i> 'under a laboratory situation' Lines 19-23 :replace the sentences with 'Tuani, (1992) who demonstrated the negative effect of jatropa seed oil on survival and feeding rates in the variegated grasshopper, <i>Zonocerus variegatus</i> L. They also reported reduced damage by <i>Z. Variegatus</i> to cassava foliage after treatment with jatropa seed oil' Line 24: relace 'scant' with 'scanty' Line 25: comma after author's name Page 9	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 1: delete 'caused' Line 3: change 'their' to 'the' Line 4: change 'i.e' to 'of' ; 'for' to 'as' Line 5: delete 'The' Line 6: add comma after 'pheromone' ; change 'for' to 'in' Line 7: delete 'integrated' ; add 'infestation,' after 'locust' Line 9: delete 'are needed' and replace with 'requires further investigation' Reference Pages 9-12 Inconsistent reference styles. Should be properly written in the reference list.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The references should follow a consistent pattern: Authors surname and initials (year). Title of paper. Journal (<i>Italicas</i>). Vol. (no): pages. The entire manuscripts should be revised again. Punctuation marks and other grammatical errors should be corrected. A number of them had been pointed out above, but the entire manuscripts should be checked again.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A good research research that will assist in cheaper control of <i>S. Gregaria</i>, especially in tropical Africa.	