

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_115723
Title of the Manuscript:	SENSITIVITY OF THE MOSQUITO CULEX PIPIENS (DIPTERA: CULICIDAE) TOWARDS TEMEPHOS IN SOUTHERN-CENTRAL, MOROCCO
Type of the Article	Research (routine type)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Materials and methods: fine, these are WHO standards</p> <p>Results: there may be a problem in species identification. <i>Culex pipiens</i> is divided in <i>pipiens pipiens</i> and <i>pipiens molestus</i>. The <i>molestus</i> form is often dominating in urban areas and this may explain that the urban collected strain had a different resistance level than the two others. This should be mentioned under discussion.</p> <p>Resistance is here measured at the ration of LC90. This is not common practise. Normally, resistance is mentioned at the LC50 level and sometimes also at the LC90 level. I would suggest that the author add resistance factor at the LC50 level to obtainboth set of data written as R_{LC50}/R_{LC90}. In tables and text</p> <p>Discussion: when referring to other tests of temephos resistance in Marocco, the author sometimes refer the levels at LC50 and LC90 and sometimes resistance ratios. This is not consistent. Since the author use a standard <i>Culex pip</i> LC50 and LC90 for the calculation of resistance ratios, all data used for comparison should be based on resistance ratios or at least these should be added to the LC levels;</p> <p>Finally, I do not see the relevance of the essential oil data. If these have significance for future Marocco programs, this should be explained (e g the author suggest a change to the use of essential oils because of the resistance to temephos). Otherwise their mentioning should be deleted. Finally, it should be elaborated if the resistance levels found has practical implications for the use of temephos.</p> <p>Once these corrections and editions are made, I would like to see the manuscript again</p> <p>Suggested editor decisions: accept after editions to be reviewed by the reviewer for final decision</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ole Skovmand
Department, University & Country	France