



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_32702
Title of the Manuscript:	β-sitosterol and its 3-O-glucosid as novel acaricides against Rhipicephalus (B.) annulatus ticks
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: I suggest to use 'Aim' not Aims To find ----- I suggest to mention the chemical name of CHCl₃-chloroform and MeOH-methanol and give the chemical formula within brackets. Follow the same throughout the manuscript. Abstract line 23: glucosid recorded 76.66±5.57% and 98.33±2.88% respectively. Abstract last line rephrase: the n-hexane extract of M. forsskaolii, β-sitosterol and β-sitosterol-3-O-glucoside may be potentially used as safer alternatives in the control of tick populations.</p> <p>Introduction: Line 2: subtropical areas. Line 2: Provide the full name of tick Line 7: safer acaricides Page 2, Line 2: I suggest to use Ravindran et al., 2012 but not Ravindran et al. 2012. Follow the same throughout the manuscript. Page 2, Line 3: ----- during the last decade, delete ten years. Page 2, Line 4: Six crude extract of wild plant ----- -. Section 2.2: delete 'of' Section 2.3: The air-dried herb of M. forsskaolii (100 g) was successfully extracted with n-hexane -----. Section 2.3, Line 2: Four concentrations were prepared for the four different extracts (1.25, 2.5, 5 and 10%) in</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>50% DMSO-EtOH. Section 2.3, Line 3: The prepared concentrations were applied on adult ticks and unfed larvae. Section 2.3, 2nd Para, Line 3: provide full form of pet.ether Section 2.6, Line 1: remove the brackets in (Sharma et al. 2012) Section 2.6, Line 2: ----- divided into six groups Section 2.6, Line 3: The different groups of ticks were immersed in 10 ml of the different concentrations of the extracts -----. Page 4, Section 2.6, line 1: ----- after 24 to 72 hours of post treatment (PT).</p> <p>References: Deshmane SS, Dev S. Higher Isoprenoids-II triterpenoids and steroids of <i>Saccharum officinarum</i>. Tetrahedron 1970; 27:1109–1118. I suggest italic the scientific names. Check the references for the same.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors of this manuscript failed to insert line numbers. It becomes very difficult to point out corrections.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>B.Malaikozhundan</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Animal Health and Management, Alagappa University, Tamil Nadu, India</i>