



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_45244
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Larvicidal Potential of the Leaf Extracts of Hyptis suaveolens Poit Used in Gwandu Emirate of Kebbi State Against Anopheles Mosquitoes
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 74 The tests that confirmed the presence of phytochemicals should be described in the methodology part Line 185-188 compares other authors' reports. Discuss your results Vs Literature review Line 192 This might be.....Justify why the differences to enrich your discussion Line 194 The results showed.....which results....Make clear your discussion Line 199 In the bioassay.....which bioassay, if it's from literature review source is missing Line 207 Avoid redundancy. The sentence is stated above Line 210 ...by various extracts.....which & whose extracts.....make clear your discussion to the reader Reference: More references are written than what is cited in your text. The following are not cited but included in the reference: Clements 2000, Coetzee et al. 2000, Cone 2009, Conti 2003, Cyrille et al. 2002, Dibua et al.2013, Harbach 2008, Nwabor 2014, Obomanu et al.2006, Spielman &....2001, Worrall 2016. Only what is cited should be written in the reference. N.B. Make sure that you have used same authors style throughout the paper	Thanks so much. I could not describe the test in line 73 because it would occupy so much pages that would exceed the recommended number of pages of this paper. I have also taken care of discussion in lines 184-211 as you pointed out and they have been highlighted. I have removed the references not cited in the text from the list of references as you indicated.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 10 Specific name of the plant species should be written as Hyptis suaveolens throughout the paper Line 12....change as against....to ...compared to Line 18 phytochemicals Line 29 Reconsider the sentence.....in the African in..... Line 61 Spelling...gramme(French)...gram Line 142 ...95% C.L stands for.....? Line 146 organisms. Line 153 (Fig 1,.....) Line 168 Reconsider sentence formation	I have effected the corrections as you indicated.
Optional/General comments	Topic: Evaluation of the Larvicidal Potential of the Leaf Extracts of <i>Hyptis suaveolens</i> Poit Against Anopheles Mosquitoes Larvae Figures 1&2 are not necessary since they are combined in Fig 3	I have also modified the title

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>