



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16149
Title of the Manuscript:	POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR SYMBIOTIC CONTROL OF INSECT VECTORS OF HUMAN PROTOZOAN DISEASES
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		N/A
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		N/A
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I reject this paper on three grounds: First, the paper should have been professionally proof read prior to submission to peer review. Many small errors in grammar detracted from the content. I found it difficult to read the paper in some sections without having to correct grammar and rewrite sentences. Also, there are some sentences that use technically correct English, but not the way the words are usually applied. The abstract reads much better than the rest of the paper making me believe that the abstract was carefully proofed for correct English. However, there are numerous mistakes throughout the paper. Second, the paper shows promise, but the author(s) does not go into any detail about the different papers he/she refers to. The reader could get the same information by reading the titles of papers. A review needs to be more robust than providing a list of papers for the reader to look up. It needs to describe the salient points common to the papers providing a 'review' of the subject so that the reader knows what these papers cover without having the read the papers themselves. A review should also bring together papers following a particular theme or thesis that the reviewer has articulated. I believe the review covers some very important aspects of vector	CONCERN ADDRESSED 1. Grammatical errors corrected. 2. Sentences that were not clear have been corrected by reframing. 3. Entire manuscript reviewed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	control, but it has not summarized the data adequately. Third, there seems to be a considerable amount of effort to provide an evolutionary history of how blood feeders evolved. Although commendable, the title does not indicate that this paper would be addressing evolutionary development, much of which is speculative. Instead, the paper promises to review symbiotic control. As such, I would suggest that evolutionary history is inappropriate for this paper unless it can be directly linked to symbiotic control, which I don't think is possible.	An overview on evolution of haematophagy is important because the manuscript is premised on blood feeding behaviour and disease transmission. Please note that in the absence of blood feeding activity, insects like mosquitoes, sand flies, reduviid bugs and tsetse flies cannot be considered as disease vectors. Also note that some of the symbionts under study are acquired by feeding activities. Title modified to capture haematophagy.
--	--	--