Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Aedes Distribution and Meteorological Effect on Ovitrap Index in Coastal Area of Besut, Terengganu: An Entomological Study"

Nilsa Elizabeth González Britez[1]

1. Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Paraguay

ARTICLE REVIEW: AEDES DISTRIBUTION AND METEOROLOGICAL EFFECTS ON OVITRAPS.....

REVIEWER 4

ABSTRACT: should be more detailed. The impact that this evaluation would have on the control of Aedes and on the health of the population is not mentioned.

INTRODUCTION: it could describe more about the endemicity of dengue or other frequent problems in the study area that are transmitted by these vectors. It is also necessary to explain what is meant by “occupied facilities,” and these should be better described and/or mention some background information observed in these facilities.

METHODOLOGY: The design, sampling, study period, instruments, and criteria included or excluded are NOT detailed. It should be clarified if this density only refers to eggs collected with ovitraps or if the larvae found were also considered. This is also part of the Aedes sp. density.

Detailed placement and collection procedures can go in annexes and not in the text itself. There is no mention of the ethical procedure of the work (since it does mention it at the end of the paper); however, it should incorporate the procedure in the method ....

It is not understood if the installations are private dwellings or not. If they are dwellings, the consent of the owners must be obtained. It would be interesting to place a map of the location and collection of the material.

doi.org/10.32388/0MNLJQ

It should be indicated if the data from the Meteorological Department correspond to monthly data or to the time of the year. Possible limitations in the work should also be mentioned.

RESULTS: the distribution (geographic area) is not mentioned when in its title it is mentioned as one of the main variables. Only frequency and correlation indexes are mentioned.

It is important to add a table with ovitrap density data as a basal parameter before making correlations.

The title of Table 1 is not clear, since it mentions ovitrap relationships with temperature and precipitation, and no specific relationship index between these variables is shown. These are values (N) taken in the sampling. It should also explain why only weeks 17, 6, and 17 are taken. This requires explanation.

DISCUSSION:

Would it be missing to talk about vector distribution?

When discussing the highest numbers of Aedes, you should better indicate that those (155) do not include Aedes aegypti or Aedes albopictus, since only Aedes could also include both species. Improve the wording: for example, Marinho et al. also support the idea...(it is written in singular).

Analyze the data obtained on the presence and abundance of Aedes species more clearly. Further comparison of the results with similar studies to identify similarities or differences is missing....

You could also mention in your discussion the Ecological and Public Health implications and discuss the relevance of the findings for the control and monitoring of Aedes as a disease vector. Finally, you could include a paragraph about the importance of integrating meteorological factors in mosquito management strategies.

CONCLUSIONS

Should better emphasize how this study would contribute to existing knowledge about Aedes and its relationship to temperature. Explain why these findings are important for future studies or for some type of intervention. Raise the need for further research in specific areas or factors not addressed in this study.

Finally, it is important to highlight or reinforce the relevance of the work to science, ecology, or public health, emphasizing the importance of monitoring these factors to combat Aedes-borne diseases.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.