

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_98325
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Entomological Parameters of Malaria Vectors in Anambra State, Southeast Nigeria
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:

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

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The abstract is well written and provides a clear overview of the study. However, it should provide more information about the study's findings, conclusions, and implications for malaria control in the study area. The abstract should be more specific about the research questions, methods, and results.</p> <p>4. Yes, however conclusion is mission</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction provides a clear background to the study, highlighting the importance of entomological parameters in planning effective malaria vector control strategies. The introduction, however, should provide more information about the study's objectives, research questions, and hypotheses. The literature review provides relevant and recent information on malaria vectors, their distribution, and their bionomics, supporting the rationale for the study. <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study area description is comprehensive and provides useful information about the location, population, and climate of the study area. The methods section provides sufficient details about the study design, sample size, sampling techniques, and data analysis methods used. However, the methods section could benefit from more specific information about the morphological and molecular techniques used to identify the mosquitoes collected. Ethical considerations and approval should be mentioned. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results section is well structured and provides detailed information about the findings of the study. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results are presented using descriptive statistics, which are appropriate for the type of data collected. • However, the section could benefit from more tables or figures to present the data more clearly. <p>Study design:</p> <p>Overall, the study design appears to be appropriate for the research question being addressed, and the methods used are well-described and standardized.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>The discussion appears to be a scientific study or research report that presents the findings related to Anopheles mosquitoes and malaria transmission in Anambra state. The results are presented systematically and discussed based on previous studies, which is a good approach. However, there are a few areas where the discussion can be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the discussion could be structured more clearly to highlight the main findings and their implications. While the current discussion presents the findings in a descriptive manner, it would be more effective to discuss the key results and their significance for the study. • Secondly, some of the sentences are long and difficult to follow. Breaking up these sentences into smaller sentences would make it easier to read and understand. • Thirdly, the discussion could be more precise and concise by using specific numbers and percentages to support the findings. For example, instead of saying "the result is lower than the result study done by Oljira et al., (2016)", it would be more effective to mention the exact difference between the two studies. <p>Overall, the discussion presents the findings and discusses their implications, but it could be improved by structuring it more clearly, using specific numbers and percentages, and making the sentences more concise.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is missing, and there is no discussion of the study's implications for malaria control in the study area or beyond. • The manuscript needs a proper conclusion summarizing the main findings, their significance, and recommendations for future research. <p>Overall, the manuscript is promising but needs improvement. The manuscript has significant gaps in interpretation, conclusions, and implications for malaria control.</p> <p>The manuscript may be accepted for publication after addressing the issues mentioned above.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Payal Das
Department, University & Country	India