



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_14415
Title of the Manuscript:	Presumptive treatment of malaria during a peak transmission season in a malaria endemic setting: a cross-sectional study
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	1. THE TITLE IS DID NOT DEPICT THE RESEARCH WORK, THERE IS THE NEED TO CHANGE IT TO REFLECT THE RESEARCH 2. THE ABSTRACT: NO JUSTIFICATION OF THIS RESEARCH. 3. WHAT IS MALARIA SYMPTOMATIC MICROSCOPY-NEGATIVE? PROVIDE SIMPLE EXPLANATION TO WHAT THAT MEANS. 4. LINE 33 & 34, WHO RECOMMENDED ..., NO REFERENCE. 5. LINE 39: FULL STOP AFTER REFS 9-12 6. LINES 40, 41 & 42: ...MICRSCOPY IS THE GOLD STANDARD, BUT IS CUMBERSOME AND REQUIRES EXPERTISE. 7. LINE 43: WHY CAPITAL A ON ARTEMISININ? 8. LINE 46: REFERENCE IS REQUIRED 9. PROVIDE A CONCISE JUSTICATION FOR THIS RESEARCH AND PROVIDE THE AIM AND OBJECTIVE. 10. WHAT IS SYSTEMATIC CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY, EXPLAIN PLEASE. 11. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY SITE IS INADEQUATE, GIVE IT SOME SCIENTIFIC/GEOGRAPHICAL FACE. 12. LINES 61 & 62: WHAT DO YOU MEAN AS ROUTINELY DONE? PROVIDE A REFERENCE. 13. LINE 63: PUT THE BRACKET (FROM SD-	1. The title has been edited to "Microscopy negative malaria during a peak transmission season in a malaria endemic setting: diagnostic accuracy of RDTs, expert microscopy and the value of presumptive treatment" 2. Justification has been provided (lines 10-14) 3. It means a patient presenting with the signs and symptoms of malaria but turns out to have negative BS results 4. Reference has been added [1], line 57 5. The full stop has been added, line 63 6. The section has been edited, lines 63-64 7. The capital A has been replaced with lower-case a, line 67 8. The reference has been given [11], line 71 9. They have been provided in lines 74-77 10. The phrase has been edited and the word systematic removed, line 80 11. The description of the study site has been edited (lines 84-87) 12. The phrase has been deleted 13. Brackets have been added, line 91



SDI Review Form 1.6

	BIOLINE. 14. LINE 65: SPACE SPACING BETWEEN MICROSCOPY AND RESULTS. 15. LINES 67 & 68: ADD : IN ACCORDANCE TO WHO OR AND OTHER REFERENCE. 16. LINE 70: DATA WAS DOUBLE ENTERED... IT DOES NOT MAKE SENSE, REPHRASE PROPERLY. 17. LINE 80: THE SENTENCE IS MISLEADING, DID YOU TEST THE SUBJECTS DAILY, WEEKLY OF MONTHLY TO ARRIVE AT THEAT CONCLUSION? 18. LINE 84: THE STUDY ALGORITHM AND RESULTS..... WHAT IS THE FIGURE EXPECTED TO CONVEY? <i>GIVE EXPLANATION(S) OR RESULTS AND THEN CLARIFY USING OT</i> 19. LINE 103: REPHRASE, THE SENTENCE IS NOT SO SCIENTIFIC 20. LINE 115: <i>falciparum</i> ITALICS 21. LINES 127 & 128: REPHRASE TO BE MORE SCIENTIFIC 22. CONCLUSION IS NOT WELL SPELT OUT 23. NO RECOMMENDATION	14. Space has been added, line 92 15. The phrase "in accordance with WHO recommendations" has been added and a reference given [13], line 95 16. The word double has been deleted 17. The sentence has been re-phrased to clear the confusion (lines 108-109) 18. The algorithm depicts the results of the study 19. The sentence has been re-phrased, lines 131-132 20. <i>Falciparum</i> has been italicized, line 141 21. The lines have been re-phrased, lines 151-154 22. The conclusion has been edited, lines 159-165 23. Recommendations have been given, lines 166-168
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. THE LANGUAGE OF PRESENTATION IS TOO CASUAL, MAKE IT FORMAL AND SCIENTIFIC 2. REFERENCES: BOLD THE VOLUME OF THE JOURNALS AND ITALICIZE THE JOURNALS	1. The language has been edited 2. References have been edited, lines 197-233
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		