

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Applied Life Sciences International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JALSI_124445 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Efficacy of the fractions of <i>Chenopodium ambrosioides</i> Linn (Chenopodiaceae) against <i>Anopheles gambiae</i> Giles and <i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i> Say larvae (Diptera: Culicidae) |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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. | The moderate novelty of obtaining fractions of the plant extract is commendable. It is rather confusing why the author takes this part of the work little for granted. Obtaining the phytochemical component of the fraction would have been so wonderful | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Efficacy of the fractions of <i>Chenopodium ambrosioides</i> Linn (Chenopodiaceae) against <i>Anopheles gambiae</i> Giles and <i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i> Say larvae (Diptera: Culicidae) in in Adamaoua region of Cameroun | |
| 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. | Fair. Please see my comments in the manuscript | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Appropriate with moderate revision. See my comments. One of the sub-title must be corrected | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and ? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The research report showed fair scientific soundness. However, see my comments in the introduction for some of my reservations. The technically sound of the experimental procedures are well crafted in systematic manner, see under abstract though | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | More references are required to be cited in the introduction section. See my comments | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Moderately. See my comments in the manuscript though | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The work is relevant and has moderately contributed to knowledge | |

Review Form 3

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: | Adesoye Oluwaseun Adegbola |
| Department, University & Country | University of Abuja, Nigeria |