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Reviewer's report:

Review
The title of the manuscript should be more succinct and specific. It would be better if the authors modify the words Evaluation of the role of some collected...... by Role of Culex and Anopheles mosquito species as potential vectors of Rift Valley Fever virus in Sudan etc, etc. Since the authors use previous data and data from their mosquitoes collection. This amendment would make the question posed better defined

Abstract
The abstract of the manuscript does not refer properly how the study was performed.

Background
The English grammar should be reviewed.

Methods
In Insect collection and identification section the authors should explain the criteria followed to prepare the pools e.g. species, genera, number of mosquitoes collected etc. Also in this section it is not necessary to mention the name of the person who did the classification. The beginning of a paragraph should not start with numbers.

In Reverse Transcription RNA section de terminus soak is not right used in this context.

In Human studies the definition a confirmed human RVFV case-patient of RVFV should be right defined. For instance, a confirmed human RVFV case-patient of RVFV was defined by one of these laboratory immunoglobulin M (IgM), RT-PCR or virus isolation positive results.

Results
I consider that the authors can use data from other studies by other authors to connect (as they exposed in the Abstract) human and entomological studies. However, in this case they discuss results that are not in Methods because, as they said, were kindly provided by the Department of Epidemiology at the Federal Ministry of Health, Sudan government. In my opinion, laboratory findings
and epidemiological data can be used in the discussion to associate them with the entomological findings of the authors but these results should not be discussed as results acquired during this work.

On the other hand, Tables are not well clarified. There is not a legend in Table 3, which make difficult to understand it. In Table 5 is not necessary to mention who was the person in charge of mosquito’s classification.

Discussion

I consider that the introduction of the Discussion is not required. This comment does not contribute to a scientific knowledge. The authors could explain that this work was developed by an expert Egyptian Team on request of the Sudanese Federal Ministry of Health.

The discussion about laboratory findings should be avoided, again, the authors should use them related to their entomological results.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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