



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	Here author tried to attempt one study among physicians. This manuscript has poorly drafted, need extensive English revision. At the beginning of background "Malaria is endemic in about 107 countries, including Nigeria." Author may consider to cite recent reference and mention Nigeria ranked 4th in the world where highest number of people are living under risk http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25104666 check figure 4. It will make the background more stronger. Line 25 and 26, page 1: there should be a reference. Line 29, there should be reference. Line 41 reference 4 should be fixed properly. RDT should be abbreviated and used later in manuscript In my understanding objective of this study cannot be achieved using cross sectional study among physicians. Qualitative study will be helpful. Table 1 will not generate any knowledge Result section line 79 – 83. I do not believe physicians can recall this information. Information line 124 – 125 well known. Table 2 & 3 does not make any sense nor created any new knowledge. Conclusion: line 176-77 is not practical. My personal observation is findings presented in this manuscript is nether important nor	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	created any new value for Nigeria at all and certainly not for global malaria community.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 1, line 21: Completely wrong statement [This could be due to the urgency of treatment and delay laboratory results.]	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	USA