

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_126791
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC CHARACTERISATION AND MOLECULAR PHYLOGENY OF AEDES VITTATUS SPECIES (DIPTERA: CULICIDAE) FROM BHAWANIPATNA, KALAHANDI, ODISHA, EASTERN INDIA BASED ON COI GENE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the genetic characterization and phylogeny of <i>Aedes vittatus</i> , a significant vector for several arboviruses, using the COI gene. By examining the molecular profile of <i>Aedes vittatus</i> populations in Bhawanipatna, Odisha, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the phylogenetic relationships and genetic diversity within this species across India and internationally. The findings are important as they highlight the potential introduction and spread of this vector in new regions, which could pose an increased risk of transmission for diseases like dengue, yellow fever, and Zika virus. I appreciate this study's contribution to vector surveillance, as it provides critical data for future mosquito control and arbovirus prevention efforts, especially in regions where <i>Aedes</i> species pose emerging threats to public health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is too long	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too long especially the introduction part. Also there is no need discussion in the abstract. In material and method also no need to write in details. In addition, no need to write the last week of ... to last week of.... . better to mention only the month.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust, as it employs standard molecular techniques for the genetic characterization of <i>Aedes vittatus</i> , including DNA isolation, PCR, and sequence alignment with the NCBI Gene Bank, ensuring accurate species identification and genetic comparison. The use of the COI gene for phylogenetic analysis is well-supported in entomology and molecular taxonomy, adding credibility to the identification and genetic profiling of the mosquito species. Additionally, the study's methodology is rigorous, with appropriate data collection across diverse locations and a well-documented sequencing process. These elements collectively enhance the scientific validity and reliability of the findings, making the manuscript a strong contribution to mosquito phylogenetics and vector-borne disease research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	ok	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Must to do proofread and increase the language quality	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please follow the citation based on journal guideline Please write the bibliography based on journal guideline No need to put figure 4 and 5 Figure 6 quality is very bad I am wondering there is no citation in discussion. How? All species names must be written in Italic In introduction part, for 10 lines you gave only one citation. This is completely wrong The quality of figure 1 is also not good	

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:	Nazir Ahmad Tookhy
Department, University & Country	Herat University, Afghanistan