



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_33710
Title of the Manuscript:	LARVICIDAL ACTIVITY OF SACOGLOTTIS GABONNENSIS STEM BARK EXTRACTS AGAINST CULEX QUINQUEFASCIATUS AND AEDES AEGYPTI MOSQUITOES IN UYO, NIGERIA
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	1. In Table 1, page 7, Why the lower concentration (0.45) has higher mortality (30%) than the high concentration 0.6, which is 29%? 2. Why the author(s) not used positive control?	1. We appreciate that you noted that typographical error. It is actually supposed to be the reverse and we have corrected that. 2. As for the use of positive control, we concluded that with the LD₅₀ and LC₅₀ determined, the experiments could be ran without a positive control since we know what concentration and dosage that would kill half of the experimental animals.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The authors should use the full names of scientific names only when used for first time, and then use the short as: <i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i> and then <i>C. quinquefasciatus</i>; <i>Aedes aegypti</i> and then <i>Ae. aegypti</i>; <i>Sacoglottis gabonnensis</i> and <i>S. gabonnensis</i> etc. 2. Line 90: Volume unit is mL not ml 3. Line 112, Table 1 4. Line 125, the word had repeated 5. Lines 147-148, the reason is not applicable in this cause 6. References inconsistent, e.g see lines 176, 216, 219, 226 etc.	We have effected the changes on the use of scientific names, mL, Table 1, deleted one "has". We feel the information in lines 147-148 is applicable in this case We have introduced "and" between the last two authors of each reference
Optional/General comments	Refer to the article	