



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46820
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Larvicidal Activities of Some Ethnobotanicals from North Eastern Nigeria Against Culicine (Dipera: Culicidae) Mosquito
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Based on the suggested points, the abstract of the article should be re-described, describing the methodology, results and conclusion items better.</p> <p>The introduction is very long, there are some repetitive information, mainly with regard to the transmission of pathogens.</p> <p>In the topic of methodology for extracting plant compounds, a more detailed description is required, with more information, such as which parts of the plants were used, whether these plants were harvested in nature or obtained from other sources, whether they were dry or fresh ...</p> <p>In the topic of toxicity bioassays, there is a big problem: the larvae used are Anophelinae, and not Culicinae. There is a conflict of this information with the title of the manuscript, which should be reviewed.</p> <p>The larvae used should also be described. There is information in the body of the manuscript of different instars used (4th and 3rd). If these were created in laboratory conditions, temperature variations and relative humidity, they should be pointed.</p> <p>Still in the methodological question, it should be pointed out how the statistical analyses were performed to describe the results obtained.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There are some problems with the spelling of scientific names, which should be reviewed.</p> <p>Review bibliography.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer,
--	--------------------	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<i>correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mário Luis Pessoa Guedes</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brazil</b>