



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_9965
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges of Malaria Diagnosis In Paediatric Patients At A Nigerian Hospital
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. ENGLISH LANGUAGE There are some minor errors of grammar and the paper needs a more careful review of English language. The author is using in some places, long sentences without punctuations e.g. line 17, 147. 2. REFERENCES References must be aligned to the format in <i>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</i>. Numbers has to be in chronological order starting from 1 and not at 29 as in this manuscript. The author has missed the reference format as the square bracket appears after the full stop and without a space. Furthermore, in case of more than one references cited, several square brackets appears in the text e.g.: Line 15: Malaria morbidity and mortality among Nigerian children is one of the highest in the world.[1]	The paper has been reviewed and punctiaon included as appropriate for line 17. Line 147 is a table The references have been revised as specified. See highlights



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 156-157: Other studies have also reported limitations in microscopy in routine settings.[11][12] The correct referencing should be: Line 15: Malaria morbidity and mortality among Nigerian children is one of the highest in the world [1]. Line 156-157: Other studies have also reported limitations in microscopy in routine settings [11, 12]. 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION In line 71:“Microscopy was performed by the usual laboratory scientists in the hospital”, however in the results and discussion section there is no mention on the quality of laboratory scientists (their formal and on job training). If the authors corrected information on the microscopists (training, work experience, quality control procedures followed etc.) need to be provided and discussed.	This was an audit of routine practices and the paper details what happens under normal work conditions without any manipulation. The microscopists were not interviewed to determine what qualifications they had. It was assumed that microscopists must have met the requirement for employment in a tertiary hospital.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In general I found the study interesting with important results for malaria diagnostics. There are some minor errors of grammar and the paper needs a more careful review of English language.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is no mention of Institutional Review Board (IRB) or any other relevant approval for the study though they got permission from the head of the paediatric department at the hospital to use patients' data.	This study was a review of records and was considered exempt from formal ethical approval process. Patients are advised routinely that their anonymised data can be used for research purposes in the teaching hospital.