



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	Although the author refereed relevant literature, the manuscript is not well written. There are a lot of grammar mistakes and seems the author is not conversant with English language that made him/her fall short in describing the relevant concepts. Introduction: This section is not focused and lacks coherence; the problem of the study has not been justified and is not coming out explicitly. There is no information on how long the Indoor Residual Spray (IRS) has been in place. It is not clear whether the hypothesis behind the change of feeding preferences was due to resistance to DDT which the author introduced in the abstract or the IRS practice perse, because the time lag between introduction of IRS and April-September, 2012 is too short for the vectors to have selected for the resistance. In addition the researcher did not test for resistance to confirm if vectors have selected for resistance, what prompted to conduct such study remains unjustified. Methods: Study site: A map could describe the sites better than it is now. Further justification to why these villages are needed to improve the manuscript. Coordinates and description of the location will add more weight to this section. Any resistance history of the <i>Phlebotomus argentipes</i> vectors to DDT or other insecticides used in	The intention behind the present study was that due to the development of resistance in <i>P. argentipes</i> 5% DDT (ref.), the sand fly instead of being killed, is migrated to the safer zone, in the night, then it return back to the nearby human dwelling places where it encounters cattles for feeding. Coordinates & description of locations were added in the section.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	IRS? Study period Justify why conduct such a study only 4 months after the introduction of IRS? Is it enough time for the vectors to have changed their behavior? Any citation to support this should be included in the introduction section Sandfly trapping The technique used to trap the flies is not clear and cannot be replicated. Aspiration is just a procedure and not a technique and there is no any citation to show whose technique was adopted? Or is it a new technique?-need to redo this section Results Authors should explain where did they get the pre-IRS results and acknowledge the source. Some of the results are presented twice, in tables and in text; the results should be consistently presented once. The axes in figures 1, 2 and 4 are not labeled so it is not clear what is being presented. No statistical test were carried out to prove if the differences in the blood meal indices were statistically significant Discussion Not focused and lacks coherence and too much repetition, example sentence number 256-257, has been repeated in 268-269. Some words too have no meaning example the word LIVELNESS OF IRS in the sentence 270 does not explain the findings observed this distracts the attention of the reader Conclusion The conclusion is not based on the study findings, the vector has not changed its behavior, from the discussion the author has made it clear that the vector prefers cattle meal over human blood meal naturally. In addition, there is no data to support that vectors have selected for	The IRS commenced during August 2012 & it remains effective for more than 6 months [ref= Monitoring & Evaluation toolkit for Indoor Residual Spraying (kala azar elimination initiative in the Bangladesh, India & Nepal) ASEARO/WHO report, November 2009, http://WHO.int/whopes/quality/en/.] and the study was conducted just after the completion of IRS i.e., from September 2012. Corrections were made in the manuscript. Corrections were made in the manuscript. Revised figure were added in the manuscript.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	resistance against DDT within 4 months of implementation so author is not supposed to conclude on that The explanation on the ethical clearance (Approval) does not tell if they obtained one, it is said that they followed ethical committee guidelines, this is not sufficiently enough to be allowed to sample flies in the households, and they did not explain if they sought consent from heads of households	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Grammar mistakes should be corrected, avoid the use of abbreviation at first mention and at the beginning of the sentence. Use of words like e.g, etc are normally not recommended in scientific write ups	Corrected inside the manuscript
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Major revision should be done on the introduction and methodology section so that the study can be replicated as highlighted earlier	Necessary amendments in the manuscript had been conducted as per the suggestions & comments received by the reviewer.