

**Abstract:**

-Adding some quantitative data, such as changes in tsetse fly populations or disease prevalence rates before and after VCC, would strengthen the abstract and provide a clearer picture of the study's outcomes.

- The abstract mentions the need to continue vector control measures until HAT is entirely eradicated from the focus area. While this is a logical conclusion, it might be useful to highlight any specific recommendations or implications arising from the study's results.

**Introduction:**

- The introduction effectively introduces the topic of HAT, its causative agent, and the vector responsible for its transmission. However, it would be beneficial to include some contextual information about the global impact of HAT, especially in the endemic countries mentioned. This could help readers understand the broader significance of the study.

-While the introduction mentions Guinea and the mangrove ecosystem as significant for HAT, providing a brief geographical context of the study area and its relevance in the fight against HAT could enhance the reader's understanding.

**Results:**

-The Results section provides a comprehensive analysis

**Discussion:**

- The discussion effectively summarizes the genetic data and analyses, showing that despite a significant decrease in fly densities after VCC, there is no genetic signature of control. However, the discussion could be enhanced by providing a more detailed interpretation of what this implies for the effectiveness of the VCC and the overall dynamics of the tsetse population.

-While the discussion acknowledges the efficiency of VCC in protecting human populations, it could expand on the implications of these findings for future vector control strategies. For example, should VCC be continued, modified, or supplemented with other approaches?

- Please remove the website link from the discussion section.