

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Applied Life Sciences International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JALSI_114691</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Distribution and Abundance of Anopheles Larvae in Toro Local Government Area, Bauchi State, North-East Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript describes the abundance and distribution of Anopheles larvae in five villages in Nigeria and in five types of habitat. The habitat with the highest larval abundance was paddy, due to the rainy season when the samples were collected.</p> <p>2. Yes, The title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is complete, presenting a general context of what is discussed in the manuscript</p> <p>4. Yes. The subsections presented in the text facilitate reading and direct the reader towards understanding the manuscript.</p> <p>5. Yes, the references are up-to-date and describe an acceptable scientific methodology.</p> <p>6. Yes, the authors have used recent and sufficient references for the work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The writing is objective, direct and up-to-date, respecting scientific standards.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The introduction is interesting, descriptive and well organized. The authors cite current data that is relevant to the manuscript. The methodology is well organized and the discussion is solid. Below are some suggestions for the authors:</p> <p>1. In the Material and Methods section, STUDY AREA, were there any selection criteria for the villages? Or were they chosen at random? Also, within this subsection, it would be interesting for the authors to insert a map with the geographical coordinates of the collection points. It would make the manuscript easier to understand. The authors also mention in this subsection that the population data is from the 2006 census. Is there nothing more recent for the area? After all, it's been 18 years.</p> <p>2. In the subsection FIELD SAMPLING OF MOSQUITOES LARVAE, just for verification: The collections were made during the month of July 2013, on a daily basis. That totals 31 collections? Please add this information.</p> <p>3. In the subsection LARVAL HABITAT CHARACTERIZATION, the authors quote: "Small incisions were made on the labeled bottles for oxygen penetration to ensure the survival of the larvae" What is the purpose of keeping the larvae alive? Why not insert them directly into 70% alcohol?</p> <p>4. Regarding the captions of the tables and figures, they should be self-explanatory. They seem incomplete to me. The figure 1 caption reads: "Mean abundance of Anopheles larvae across habitat types", which would be interesting: "Mean abundance of Anopheles larvae across habitat types collected in Nigeria during July 2013".</p> <p>5. Sometimes the fonts of the figures are illegible. Improve image quality.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Halison Correia Golias</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Technological University of Paraná, Brazil</b>