



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_38023
Title of the Manuscript:	Biological activity of Cupressus sempervirens extracts against Musca domestica
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>)

**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><b>Abstract:</b> Prefer the active voice to the passive voice;</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> we suggest to create one paragraph with a brief review of the biological aspects of <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> ;</p> <p><b>Material and Methods:</b> we suggest to define the site of plant origin, climate data, part of the plant used for the extracts. Lack of chemical characterization, solvent used to suspended to the solutions concentration used.</p> <p><b>Results and discussion:</b> the graphs and the tables are not self explain. The histograms are not tridimensional.</p> <p><b>References:</b> Please change the olds for new ones, e.g., Sukumar et al. (1991), Gad-Allah, (1991), Engelmann, (1970),</p> <p><b>Ethical issue:</b></p> <p>The authors not show any number of agreement by ethical committee</p>	<p>I agree with you in these comments and I had corrected most of it.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		