

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Annual Research & Review in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARRB_88462 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparative Repellency of Selected Plants to Adult Anopheles gambiae complex (Gilles) in the Laboratory |
| 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript needs through edit for space. This many numbers of extra space and sometime no space in a submitted manuscript is not desirable.2. In the abstract there is a heading called study design. The described topic there is not study design rather study location. Please edit that.3. Is there any institutional ethical committee by which the use of healthy volunteers for mosquito bite test is approved? If yes, please provide proper approval number in the manuscript.4. In the method section, all the citations are needed for all the protocol used.5. Many times, in the method section, the sentence is not complete. Please edit those.6. Only the tables are not sufficient for the result section. Statement of the result s is needed. <p>The 1st paragraph of the discussion section is a statement of the result. All the phytochemical tested in the study were not discussed at all in the discussion section. Why were they tested at all? Is there any evidence of mosquito repellent action reported for those organic components before? If yes, please cite those. Phytochemical analysis was discussed in the 2nd paragraph of the discussion. Not sure since they have not been isolated and tested as pure chemical in the study. It will be research into in future.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Manuscript has been edited2. The study design has been edited3. There was no institutional ethical committee but volunteers gave verbal consent, after being briefed about the research4. Citations on methodologies have been included.5. It has been edited6. The results have been discussed |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

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? | <p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Is there any institutional ethical committee by which the use of healthy volunteers for mosquito bite test is approved? If yes, please provide proper approval number in the manuscript. Verbal consent was given</p> | No |