



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_35655
Title of the Manuscript:	A retrospective study of Plasmodium falciparum infection in Ngaski Local Government of Kebbi State, North-west, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original 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	- I suggest the title should be changed to read 'A retrospective study of Plasmodium parasite infection in Ngaski Local Government of Kebbi State, North-west, Nigeria'. This is because during hospital diagnosis speciation of the parasites are not usually done. And since it is a retrospective study, authors can't determine whether the malaria disease is due to plasmodium or malariae which are both prevalent in endemic regions. See Christopher Igbeneghu and Alexandra B. Odaibo paper, titled "Plasmodium Species among the Inhabitants of Iwo Community, Southwestern Nigeria" 3% of their participants had <i>P. malariae</i>, and 3.7% had mix infection. This change should also reflect in the body text. - In line 117, 121 and 122, references 14, 16 and 17 are studies conducted in pregnant women which is a different sample population, therefore is not a good basis for comparison with 13 years and below children. If there is the need to do so, acknowledge the fact that they are different populations. - Also in reference 12, the study participants are asymptomatic, but the participants here are symptomatic therefore not a good comparison. - In lines 126 and 127 the statement "It was observed in this study that children with age's ≤ 5 years had the highest prevalence of <i>P. falciparum</i> infection as compared with age 5 and above" contradicts the statement in lines 88 and 89 "age 5 and above had a higher infection rate, out of the 4281 patients sampled 2913 (68.05%) were infected and age ≤ 5 years had a lower infection rate, out of the 4807 patients sampled, 2948 (61.32%) were positive of the infection. Check the information in the chart, and reconcile with your statements	In agree with reviewer comment A retrospective study of Plasmodium Parasites infection in Ngaski Local Government of Kebbi State, North-west, Nigeria In line 126 and 127 It was observed in this study that children with age's ≤ 5 years had the lower prevalence of <i>P. falciparum</i> infection as compared with age 5 and above. Patients above 5 years of age had a higher infection rate 2913 (68.05%) and children less than 5 years of age had a lower infection rate 2948 (61.32%).
Minor REVISION comments	- Duration of study is not consistent in line 67 the duration is (2013-2016), but in table 1, it is (2014-2016) - In line 119 the statement with this text is not complete, as it stands, it has no meaning "attributed to low control in the study area"	In line 67, the period is for three (3) years (2014-2016).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. In line 132, author's mention parasitic infection, but nothing is said about it in the methods. This need reconciliation. 4. In line 138 the name of the author for reference article 26, has different font	In line 138 the name of the author for reference article 26, font has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A good article	Thanks. All suggestions are very useful as corrections have been noted and taken care of.