SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
Most of the topics indicated for correction and revision were not accomplished as needed. Below I will list some of them: 1. . The authors argue that the plant was bought in a renowned alternative therapy centre. They should include this information in the manuscript with the name of the botanist responsible for plant identification as well. 2. No improvement in the description of the rearing methods for mosquitoes was given. More important, the authors collected eggs of *A. gambiae* in the wild. How they can be sure about the proper identification of this species? As far as I know the *A. gambiae* comprises a complex of different species that are morphologically identical. 3. The concentrations used for LC calculations were not included. 4. Statistical analysis was not performed as indicated. 5. The authors mentioned something about Table 1 but I did not asked them to remove this table, but I still think that the data from Table 2 should be mentioned in the text only. 6. I did not address the approaches authors mentioned in their response, but about how the data was displayed in the Tables 3 and 4, that still confusing to me. 7. The discussion about chemical components of different extracts was not included.	

8. Figure and table legends are still not self-explanatory **9.** The conclusions still not reflect the objectives. The journal guideline clearly states that conclusions must be supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript and 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) **10.** The authors did not perform most of the requested revision and corrections of the manuscript as indicated in my previous review.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer