



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	- Your methodology was not clear; i. Were the data confirmed cases of malaria? ii. Was the data collected on daily, weekly or monthly? - How was malaria determined in the health facility (? RDTs, or microscopy). - What statistical software/version was used for the analysis? - Please include relevant statistics, such as, P-values or Confidence Intervals here (7th, 8th 9th and 10th sentence of the abstract). - What is your general conclusion after your research? Briefly specify it at the end of the abstract. - Data collection and analysis was not well written. (Refer to review comments point 2, 3 and 4). Secondly, refer to a document that explains this procedure - You mentioned the chi square test but nothing shows that this statistical tool was used. Example; under abstract, line 77, 85, 100: (Chi-square test shows a significance difference: what were the values?) you cannot state these without any basis.	I agreed with the reviewers comments and corrections are been effected. Microscopic was used to determined malaria parasites in the health facility Chi-square test was used to compare the relative frequencies between group (sex and age). Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version (20 IBM) set at alpha range which shows that when $p > 0.05$ Relevant statistics added Correction effected Procedure has been explained
Minor REVISION comments	3rd sentence of the abstract: This study was carried out to determine the prevalence of... - Reconstruct the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th sentences of the abstract. These were poorly written. - Please reconstruct the 2nd sentence of the introduction (line 10- 13). - Line 20: WHO estimated that... - Line 21 to 24 and 34 to 37: reconstruct the sentences here. Poorly written - Line 46: Please insert share and not sharing	This study was carried out to determine the prevalence of Plasmodium parasites Reconstruction has be made WHO estimated that in 2015



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Please rephrase line 49 to 52. • Please don't be mixing past and present tenses together e.g. (line 55, go through the work and correct the rest) • Under abstract: you mentioned that the duration of the study was from 2014-2016 however at Line 65: you stated differently that the collection was done from 2013 to 2016. Please insert the correct time	Share has been included Line 49 to 52 has been Rephrased duration of the study was from 2014-2016
Optional/General comments	This paper could be good but it is not statistically sound. Secondly, some text under result and discussion need to improve.	