



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_49717
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Efficacy of Varied Concentrations imidacloprid in the Laboratory Management of Termites (<i>Microtermes natalensis</i>)
Type of the 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors studied the "Comparative Efficacy of Varied Concentrations imidacloprid in the Laboratory Management of Termites (<i>Microtermes natalensis</i>)". While I have no objection against publishing the data, I have some issues that need addressing. I am concerned about the poorly elements in the discussion; authors must be provided a good debate for results interpretation. The data were collected carefully; however, experimental set up of this study does not appear to be well-designed. Also, information about some statistical values obtained in the experiments must be provided and detailed in the results section. I think that this manuscript requires substantial rewriting to make its results clearer and more readily interpretable to the reader. My specific comments are listed in the "Manuscript". Based on the comments above reported, my opinion is that this manuscript may be suitable for printing on this journal after corrections.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Carlos Martínez
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Viçosa, Brazil