



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_45025
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIAL OF FIVE LOCAL PLANT AS PROTECTANT AGAINSTS HIDE BEETLE, DERMESTES MACULATUS DEGEER INFESTING DRY CAT FISH ; CLRIAS GARIEPINUS BURCHELL.
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>)



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	The work was done on an interesting pest of stored product however there are some corrections. The topic stated ...POTENTIAL OF FIVE LOCAL PLANT AS PROTECTANT AGAINSTS HIDE BEETLE,DERMESTES MACULATUS DEGEER INFESTING DRY CAT FISH ; CLRIAS GARIEPINUS BURCHELL....The topic needs corrections. In the first place it should read <i>Clarias gariepinus</i>. Secondly from the work done topic should change to Insecticidal effects of five local plants against hide beetle <i>Dermestes maculatus</i> Degeer infestation of dried African catfish <i>Clarias gariepinus</i>. Not infesting dry catfish. More over did you use whole catfish or catfish muscle? The authours wrote in line 15 the work was done Complete Randomized Design (CRD) in the laboratory. They should write rather completely randomized design.In line 16 the wrote that highest concentration (6)...is 6 a measure of concentration?6 what?Similarly they wrote in line 19....The number of adults emerged were significantly lower than control at (p>0.005)....The sentence is wrong and should read The number of adults that emerged were significantly lower than control at (p>0.005)....More over the probability level significant sign ((p>0.005)) is wrong. This sign is used when there is NO sig difference. This in line 59 <i>Balanite agyptiaca</i> (K) should be in italics. Your materials and methods are confusing you wrote as follows in line 90 to 93 Mortality data were taken at one (1) three (3) and seven (7) days post treatment. After seven days both live and dead insect were discarded, eggs and larvae were counted. The set up was kept for the emergence of F1 adult from 35 days after treatment until all adult emerged.... When you discarded both live and dead insects which gave F1 generation? Does it take 35 days of gestation for <i>D maculatus</i> to hatch? You stated as follows Line 94 to 95, Weight loss due to D. maculatus infestation was determined at 4, 8 and 12 weeks of post treatment. After discarding the insect what was your parameter to determine weight loss? Does the insect not contribute to waste loss? This plethora of confusion is bad for repeat of this work. In line 187 to 196 your discussion wrote.... The result of the investigation reveals all the plant powder used at different amount 190 cause considerable reduction in weight loss of dried fish infestation. There was 191 significant (p<0.05) reduction in percentage weight loss of smoked fish treated 192 with powder of P. guinense and E. aromatic compared to other plant powder tested 193 and untreated fish. The reduction in weight loss reflect the number of surviving 194 larvae and adult emerged from respective treated fish. The highest weight loss was 195 recorded in untreated (control) this could be as a result of feeding activities of D. 196 maculatus larvae, on the fish which subsequently cause highest weight loss... Now is it powder that results in weight loss? Or D maculates? Read your work again and see the difference and confusion with feeding of beetles. Correct this anomaly please. In your tables you were referring to treatment values as concentration why? Please correct it because concentration is a different thing altogether.	
Minor REVISION comments	Note in the work that the it is againt juvenile hide beetle.This is because Hide beetle can live up to 5 to 6 months.The powder may not have as much effects on the older hide beetle as it had on newly emeged. Check your English.Series of missed words abound	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>U.D Enyidi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>