

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_91091
Title of the Manuscript:	Mosquito diversity and relative abundance in Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi State, North central 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:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Abstract:</b> I recommend to concise your information. It is so elaborative. Suggest to rewrite this part. <b>Introduction:</b> In general, introduction is not proper. Your introduction did not focus on your title. I recommend rewriting again. <b>Results:</b> Experimental design was simple, and interpretation of results was not clear. However, some problems are seen in discussion. Summarize the table and make it one. You can add figures for comparing weeks, species composition and sites that would be better for readers. In block A why mosquito abundance is high you can explain your hypothesis. In addition, you can explain why Anopheles species is so rich in every block. You can add the ecological factors to influence to increase this species. <b>Discussion:</b> More detailed explanation is needed in the discussion part. <b>Conclusion:</b> In conclusive para you can highlight the reason why Anopheles control is important in your area.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I admire your work; I think you made abundantly clear the importance of your work. After completing the corrections, I recommend it for publication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In my experience, the manuscript is so weak in their presentation. Font size, scientific name was not proper and English problem. We would like to accept this paper for publication after revision. This paper is acceptable after necessary corrections in the light of queries, comments and suggestions, etc.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Afroza Sultana
Department, University & Country	Jagannath University, Bangladesh