



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(<i>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</i>)
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-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	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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	
Minor 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	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kabiru Abdullahi
Department, University & Country	Department of Biological Sciences, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto. Nigeria