



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	The main idea of the review is good: “This work reviews the evolution of haematophagy in insects, current emerging knowledge and developments on microbial symbiosis in mosquitoes, sandflies, triatomine bugs and tsetse flies that are feasible and holds promise for development of symbiotic control strategies for major human insect borne parasitic protozoan diseases: malaria, leishmaniasis, trypanosomiasis” but authors need to explain widely in the abstract, to differentiate it from the Ricci's review.	CONCERN ADDRESSED 1. ABSTRACT HAS BEEN REVIEWED 2. RICCI'S WORK FOCUSED ON MALARIA VECTORS ONLY AS OPPOSED TO THIS REVIEW WHICH IS BROADER AND ADDRESSES VECTOR MOSQUITOES, SAND FLIES, REDUVIID BUGS AND TSETSE FLIES.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's Comment Line 8-11, 15-19: There are paragraphs equal to the review of Ricci et al. 2012 Line 12-13: Standardize the types and sizes of letters used in the text Line 41: repetitive Line 138: Add the reference of this work: “removing mycetome body containing symbionts in louse <i>Pediculus humanus</i>”	CONCERNS ADDRESSED AS INDICATED BELOW: 1. Lines 8-11, 15-19 reviewed. 2. Line 12-13 fonts standardized. 3. Line 41 repetition removed



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 194: The columns headings in Table 2 cannot see Line 350: editing error: For instance, he release Line 378: year? Line 328: 8. CHALLENGES AND CONCLUSIONS: Authors need to conclude more emphatically on the points discussed in the manuscript. Maybe they could divide and leave a section on CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS and other CONCLUSIONS. Line 358: REFERENCES= authors need to format references, according to the journal This manuscript uses many references included in the review of Ricci et al. 2012, and you need to strengthen the objective of this manuscript with a greater number of references and detailing work. There are approximately 20 similar to those included in Ricci, a third of the references	Column headings included Should read The corrected. Year not necessary. Reviewed to CONCLUSIONS. Formatted Most the references were on malaria vectors. As a widely studies area there are a lot literature to cite not necessarily from Ricci's work. The same is widely captured in related works cited in text and reference list.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The main idea of the review is good, but authors need to explain widely in the abstract, to differentiate it from the Ricci's review	Abstract has been reviewed to make more focused and addresses more than one protozoan infections.