| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Zoology |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_AJRIZ_45050** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Potential of column purified fractions of Allium cepa against intermediate host of urinary schistosomiasis (Bulinus globosus) in Sokoto, Nigeria** |
| 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)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | **Using column extraction method, the study investigated the molluscicidal potential of *Allium cepa* extract against *Bulinus globosus*, an important intermediate host of the urinary schistosomiasis causal agent, *Schistosoma haematobium*. The study was conducted to provide a more cost-effective and eco-friendly biocontrol alternative in the control of the schistosomiasis snail vectors.**<br><br>**However, the manuscript contains a range of issues, including grammatical and spelling errors. The major observations I made are highlighted below:**<br><br>**1) Reading the title in the first place, I felt like asking 'what potential?' The title will be better written as "Molluscicidal potential of..."**<br><br>**2) There were a number of inappropriate references. For example, ref. [1] does not define urinary schistosomiasis but only focussed on HIV/schistosomiasis coinfection. Also, ref [5] does not discuss snail mollusciciding. It is always better to cite papers that substantially focus on the subject matter.**<br><br>**3) Line 40. "highly toxic plants"? Won't these also have unintended effects on other aquatic fauna? Of course, high toxicity associated with synthetic chemicals is the same factor that created the need for more eco-friendly biocontrol approaches in the first place.**<br><br>**4) Line 108-109. Confusing. These fraction concentrations do not correlate with those listed in Table 1.**<br><br>**5) Line 155-158. Since no phytochemical analysis to identify the chemical nature of each fraction was done in the methodology, it is not tenable to state precisely, in the discussion, the chemical constituents eluted in higher amounts in some of the fractions.**<br><br>**6) Line 173-175. This may be misleading. Only experimentally proven and generally endorsed plant products could be recommended for use by the public. Otherwise, there may be a widespread and abusive usage of plant products that are even detrimental to the aquatic life by the public. I think this paragraph should not be included.**<br><br>**7) There were many issues with the list of references. For example, incomplete authors list (e.g., in Ref. 1); wrong authors citation (e.g., in Refs 3, 15 & 22); Ref. 22 not cited in the text; wrong reference citation/citation not found (e.g., Refs 9&10); wrong (exaggerated) publication dates (e.g., in Refs 4, 5, 7 & 11); wrong journal name (e.g., in Ref. 23); and so on.** | All corrections have been effected and highlighted in the original copy of the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer. |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | 1. *Allium cepa* should subsequently be written as *A. cepa* after the first mention in the text.<br>2. Authors name need to precede many in-text references cited. For example, in line 61, "...described by [15]" should be written as '...described by Nesti et al. [15]'. | |
| **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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |