



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11746
Title of the Manuscript:	Biocidal activities of Solvent extracts of <i>Azadirachta indica</i> against Some Endemic Tropical Vector-borne diseases.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	The authors present new descriptive data based on the mortality effect of different extracts of bark and roots of Azadirachta indica in two tropical vectors. Despite of their nature as basic descriptive research using crude extracts, screening studies on the biological activities of plant extracts and substances are important data for future development of drugs, insecticides and worth publication in my opinion. On the other hand, if accepted, based on the data and discussion presented, the manuscript should be published as a short communication. 1. A major English and grammar review is needed 2. Include the botanist responsible for plant identification and voucher deposit number in the herbarium. (the proper plant material identification is mandatory before publication) 3. Include more details in the methodology (general) mostly about larval breeding methods and laboratory condition used for both vectors. 4. Why positive controls did not include a known biocidal agent, e.g an insecticide? 5. Include the concentrations used for LC 50 and LC100 determination using Probit analysis.	The manuscript can be published as short communication The plant (bark and root), was identified and collected from a renowned alternative therapy centre (Amolab Centre for Alternative Therapy), in Yenagoa Metropolis, Nigeria. Copper sulphate is an alternative pesticidal agent whose application as positive control is documented in literature (Agboola et al., 2011; Bassey et al., 2013).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Authors used a powerful statistical package to estimate LCs, but no other statistical analyses were performed to check for significant differences in the mortality among different solvent extracts or plant parts in the vectors studied. Proper statistical analysis must be performed to test their hypothesis about the effects of extracts, plant part and time on the mortality. 6. Table 2 is not needed since all extracts and concentrations tested resulted in 100% mortality. Author can state these results in the text. 6. Figure and table legends must include all the information related to the data presented, i.e. self-explanatory. 7. Table 3 and 4 are confusing and present concentrations in the columns supposed to display vector mortality. I suggest that the authors use just one row for the results of concentrations ranging from 75-500 ppm (table 3) and 100-500 ppm (table 4) since they all resulted in 100% mortality. 8. The authors give almost no information in the discussion about the chemical composition of bark and root extracts with different solvents that might be related with the results found. The chemical constitution of plant species in present study was already extensively studied and data is certainly available. Discussion must be rewritten after literature review. 9. Figures 1 and 2 should be presented in line graphs since they display time course dataset and are easier to compare the different solvents. Also data must be statistically analyzed.	A different robust screening (rapid and final screening) method, using several concentrations was adopted. The range of activity, with the minimal lethal concentration was detected. Although, all extracts of the plant induced total mortality during the rapid screening, I therefore suggest that; removing this result (table 1), will conflict the experimental procedures. For instance, the rapid Screening was a prerequisite to the final screening results. Besides it is scientifically moral to report results as observed. I think/suggest that the results on table 3 and 4 showing 100% mortality are clearer, since a robust approach was adopted to arrive at the final results. Notwithstanding, the column having the screening concentrations (Tables 3 and 4), has been demarcated from the mortality rates. The range having the actual minimal and median lethal concentrations were indicated below the tables 3 and 4, are distinguished and marked in "Bold" font I think the conclusion reflects the results; Since it is indicative of the fact that all extracts induced mortalities at lower concentrations and hence, favours their application as biocidal agents.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. Conclusions are not related to the data presented. The authors present only perspectives and speculative comments. Conclusions must be rewritten based on the results presented.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		