



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13283
Title of the Manuscript:	MALARIA DIAGNOSTIC TESTING AMONG PUBLIC HEALTH PHYSICIANS, NIGERIA
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	This manuscript reports a succinct work with a clear objective. The study shows that the public health physicians infrequently resort to laboratory confirmation in malaria case management. Laboratory tests were done in only 51% of adults and 48% of children treated last. The introduction was well written and the results were presented impressively. More details required on the methodology. How was the sample size determined? Was this study designed to be a total population study of the conference participants, out of which 125 responded? How many public health physicians attended the conference? This should be stated clearly. Were there exclusion criteria? More descriptions of the data analysis should be included. An important variable was apparently not	Corrected Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	included in the questionnaire: <i>'the reason for not using laboratory test in the last patient treated.'</i> This is an important piece of information relevant to the application of this research. Its absence simply left the authors speculating the reasons for their findings (lines 20-21,176-177). The discussion section is quite tedious to follow. Significant corrections of punctuations and syntax required. Also, the discussion can progress in the following suggested sequence to enhance clarity: Paragraph 1: The high knowledge of recommended laboratory testing for malaria; Paragraph 2: The low level of actual testing; Paragraph 3: Differences in the rates of testing adults and children; Paragraph 4: Variables influencing the use of the laboratory tests in the literature and those identified (if any) in this cohort; Paragraph 5: Conclusion In every paragraph, the findings should be compared and contrasted with prior reports	Corrected Corrected Corrected
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of physician surveys in similar settings or elsewhere.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 143: 'should' or 'showed'?	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	none	