



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_24094
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of aqueous root bark and seed extracts of Azadirachta indica and pyrethrin in the treatment of ticks (hyalomma spp) <i>in vitro</i> .
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<u>Title</u> The title could be revised to exclude pyrethrin. Pyrethrin was used as a standard to compare with activity of the plant extracts and not part of the extracts <u>Materials and Methods</u> Provide a brief description or reasons for using sand/sawdust in this experimental setup. <i>2.4: Processing of the sawdust and sand samples.</i> The use of sawdust may have come from treated wood/timber which may contain chemicals. How was sawdust treated apart from just drying in room temperature and how were chemical residues cleared from dust – if any. <i>Line 76 in 2.6 In vitro acaricidal efficacy test</i> should be corrected to have (n=13) to differentiate from reference. Line 77: containing either <u>extracted</u> powder acaricide	The title has been modified. In veterinary medicine/parasitology sand and sawdust serve as litter were the ticks rest. See line 83. We sourced sawdust from woods that were not chemically treated. This has been corrected to 12 groups.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 97 -98: the sentence line does not make sense – where does packed cell volume and table for mean parasite count comes in?? Where is the Table in the MS text?? Results The text is OK. Figure 1: This is an interesting graph – what it clearly shows is that more than half (>50%) of ticks were killed within 3 days by different experimental conditions -even under <u>control environment</u> except for 100% sand. How can this observation be explained? As for the sawdust, it behaved similar to seed extracts of the plant. This raises question whether chemicals were present in the dust. One would have expects sawdust to behave like sand. Require explanation as well. Figure 2: Sand seemed to have a positive effect on the survival of ticks Acar50/SD has been explained but what are R50 or S50 represent. Need clarification as footnote under each Fig 1 and Fig 2.	Noted. Line 97-98 has been corrected. The sand compared with the control but was still more potent in terms of survival of the ticks post incubation. The sawdust was also similar but less than the standard acaricide meaning that some unidentified phytochemicals that have acaricidal properties were present. The sawdust were collected from the commercial timber market in Maiduguri and could have been treated also with unknown chemicals. But what is interesting in this research is that the neem seed extract had acaricidal properties that compared favourably with the pyrethrin mechanism and potency. Footnote has been included.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<u>General comments</u> The investigator assessed the <i>Azadirachta indica</i> plant extracts on the tick incubated under different conditions. The study design has been well thought out and manuscript is generally written well. However, there are some minor issues that needs to be addressed.	
---	--	--