



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2205
Title of the Manuscript:	Biopesticide activities of some plant extracts: a potential alternative to chemical pesticides

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 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	<p>I do not understand the purpose of the present manuscript. A short review should provide a summary of an area of research and provide an entry point into the scientific literature on a subject. But this manuscript is not authoritative, up-to-date, or even accurate.</p> <p><i>Calotropis</i> extracts would never be approved for use in any jurisdiction that regulates pesticides given the notorious pharmacological activity of cardenolides in mammals. (Also note, the authors never even mention cardenolides, although they show structures of several such compounds)</p> <p>Botanical insecticides based on <i>Annona</i> species have already been rejected by US regulatory authorities based on the mammalian toxicity of the acetogenins, the active principles in the seeds.</p> <p>The present authors list numerous other secondary plant substances in both genera of plants, but the prevailing evidence points to the cardenolides in <i>Calotropis</i> and the acetogenins in <i>Annona</i> seeds as the insecticidal principles.</p> <p>The literature reviewed is mostly from obscure sources with minimal recognized impact. A cursory search in the <i>ISI's Web of Science</i> turned</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>up a dozen recent papers on insecticides from <i>Annona</i> species, none of which are cited in the manuscript, and similarly a half dozen recent papers on <i>Calotropis</i> extracts as insecticides, none of which are cited.</p> <p>There are numerous other inaccuracies in the manuscript (such as outdated latin binomials for some of the plants discussed), and the entire manuscript would require thorough editing by a native Anglophone as the grammar is currently not at a minimally acceptable level for an English language journal. Given that the subject of botanical insecticides has been reviewed in detail in several books and in the <i>Annual Review of Entomology</i>, I don't see any value in pursuing publication of this error-filled manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Murray B. Isman
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Land and Food Systems, University of British Columbia, Canada