

Author's Feedback against Reviewer's Comment:

Reviewer 3

Comments: The authors propose a review on the bioactive of compounds/extracts of Plant origin as potential bioinsecticides. The revision is merely descriptive and driven by a survey of published results with some of the known compounds obtained from two plants that were especially focused in the text. I believe this revision undergoes various deficiencies. Below I cite some aspects that should be considered in a review to justify its publication:

- 1 – It should be interesting to a great public or the results reported about a very close subject should be of very high impact over the currently knowledge on the field. This work fulfills neither of both cases.
- 2 – The text is superficial, generalist and only reports literature data. Nowadays even in revision works, original data are required to give a better status of the field;
- 3 – Almost all data are concerned on two species. Note of worth some sections deal with biological activity of plants related to pharmacology which is out of scope. In many parts of the text this review completely marginalizes the main theme proposed.
- 4 – Authors do not clear state the present status neither the further prospects of the field, a key element on revision manuscripts.
- 5 – It is also observed that the cited literature is concentrated in local journals; most of the recent literature concerning insecticidal properties of *C. procera* is not cited at all and many citations are very from the past.

Answers:

1. The review has been revised and new references have been added in the manuscript.
2. The data from the original work of authors and that of others are cited.
3. The title has been modified and the biopesticide activities of other plant extracts are also included.
4. The status and further prospects of the work have been included in the text.
5. The recent published reports are cited.