



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16170
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysing host preference behaviour of Phlebotomus argentipes (Diptera: Psychodidae) under the impact of Indoor Residual Spray.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: • Re-write this statement objective • Under method: delete were after IRS • Please re-write the whole abstract section. It's organization is difficult to understand Introduction: • Please include the objective of the study at the end of the introduction section Material and methods: • Re-write the paragraph under study area • Re-write section 2.4 Results: • For Table 1 it will be interesting to see the relationship between habitats and pre-IRS treatment. Could you please perform chi-square tests to see the association between these groups? • similarly for Table 2 • Re-write section 3.2	The subheadings Abstract, Introduction, Material and methods had been modified as per the suggestion proposed by the reviewers of this manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Discussion: • Compare your results with previous studies if there are any. • what are the strength and limitations of this study? • Please write a statement to discuss this point. As general comments, the manuscript has to be edited by scientific editor. Most of the sentences are big and difficult to understand. The authors have to re-write most of the sentences	Blood Meal Identification and Forage ratio with respect to IRS in case of sand flies had been reported for the first time in present study. However, we have compared our results of FR that had been studied earlier in case of mosquitoes. The discussion section had been modified as per the suggestion proposed by the reviewers of this manuscript.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript has to be edited by scientific editor. Most of the sentences are too big and difficult to understand. The authors have to re-write most of the sentences	The suggestions proposed by the reviewer had been taken into consideration, and necessary amendments in the manuscript had been conducted accordingly.