



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 29-32: The sentence is too long to produce a meaning. Break down the sentences into two or three parts to make it understandable.</p> <p>Line 40: Tense to be corrected. Please use past tense and third person while writing a scientific manuscript unless mentioned in guide to authors.</p> <p>Line 43-44: Language correction required.</p> <p>Line 45: What do the authors mean by "The pool of the plants". Language correction required.</p> <p>Line 47-50: Authors write about pyrethrum and its non-suitability due to certain drawbacks, but, the language used makes it difficult for general readers to understand.</p> <p>Line 52-58: Recent review and research papers can be referred for the same, why 20 years old ones?</p> <p>Line 59-67: No reference given. Please give references for the same. Language correction also required Eg: "Rotenone is unstable and very toxic to the fish." Exaggeration like "very" "too much" should be used to the minimum.</p> <p>Line 79-83: The authors have to either give the common name or the scientific name. It would be appreciated if a table containing common name, scientific name and the active component of the plant can be given. Repetition of plant names eg: tobacco and <i>Nicotiana tabacum</i> .</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 88: “field crops during in storage”. Language correction required.</p> <p>Line 91-98: Reference required.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Pesticidal activity of plants, the authors mention in their manuscript has been extensively reviewed previously. The authors have not made new attempts in improving the field of bio-pesticides. They are not clear in their views when mentioning “Bio-pesticide”. Bio-pesticides are compounds from plants, insect, marine organisms, microbes and viruses or the organism itself that is used in pest control. Are they targeting agricultural pests, veterinary pests, medical pests or micro-organisms?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The authors have made a good attempt. But the quality of the paper goes down when it comes to the flow of the paper and language. It is better that the paper be corrected by an Anglophonic person prior submission. The authors should use the most recent references (7 years old) rather than (20-25 years) old references. Use of old references makes the impact of the review paper go low. The authors have to do an extensive search for manuscripts prior to writing a review. I could notice that the authors have not included in their review, the use of essential oils as bio-pesticides on which extensive work has been carried out. I could also notice that some lines are directly taken from the references. The authors have to make an attempt to write on their own. The quality of the paper is too low to be published in this form. A corrected manuscript would really be appreciated. Please see the review by Dr. Murray Isman in the Annual Reviews of Entomology (2006) to get an idea. The authors can write to me in case they need the above mentioned review.</p> <p>Some lines are directly a copy of certain references the authors have used.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vivek Kempraj
Department, University & Country	Department of Entomology and Nematology, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bangalore, India