



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>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>4 – Authors do not clear state the present status neither the further prospects of the field, a key element on revision manuscripts.</p> <p>5 – It is also observed that the cited literature is concentrated in local journals; most of the recent literature concerning insecticidal properties of <i>C. procera</i> is not cited at all and many citations are very from the past.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details: _____

Name:	Anonymous Reviewer:- Reviewer does not want to disclose his/her identity
Department, University & Country	