



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_25890
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology of Plasmodium falciparum Malaria in the Ikata-Likoko Area of Mount Cameroon: 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	"Epidemiology of <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i> Malaria in the Ikata-Likoko Area of Mount Cameroon: A Cross Sectional Study" is a very interesting manuscript that attempts to determine the prevalence of Malaria and evaluate the socio-demographic, clinic and preventive factors that are associated with Malaria infection in the Ikata-Likoko area. Despite it is well written, there are some considerations and suggestions to do. 1- Abstract has to be written considering a background, with the aim(s) of the study, materials and methods, results and conclusion. It has to be concise and has only to summarize the principal points of the study. Please, review and write it again. 2- It is not needed to add a list of abbreviations. These ones should appear in the text, in brackets, after the first time in which the word that they mean appears in the text. 3- Introduction is well written and do not need any change. The first paragraph explains the aims of this study and does a link between Introduction and Material and Methods. 4- As regards to Methods, please consider this topic as "Materials and Methods". The subtopic "Study area" can be summarized because it is too extensive. Please, include in the topic "Study population" the information concerning the total number of patients	Our appreciations to the reviewers for their comments aimed at improving the quality of this manuscript. 1-In as much as we would have loved to make a statement on background in the abstract, we had to strictly follow the sections on the "guidelines for authors" as elaborated in the "sample abstract" i.e., aims, methods, results and conclusions. However we have reviewed the word load to make it more concise. 2-Agreed; abbreviations have been deleted. 4- Topic "Methods" has been changed to "Materials and Methods". Though we find everything under "study area" necessary, we have however summarised some details. Information on the total number of



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and blood samples, the gender and the mean age – these ones are characteristics of the study participants and have to appear in Methodology. Consequently, it is not to be in the beginning of the topic “Results”. Criteria of inclusion and exclusion of participants have to be depicted. 5- Regarding “Results”, please, review the table 1, considering the characteristics mentioned above for “methods”. The other tables and explanations about the results obtained are in accordance with the aims. 6- Discussion is well written but it could include the comparison with other studies. Besides, the limitations of the study are not mentioned. 7- Review the References according to Author Guidelines by Sciencedomain International.	participants and blood samples, gender and mean age have been moved from the “results” to “study population”. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion are included in the “study population: age above one year, duration of stay of above two months within study area and acceptance to be part of the study. 5-Table 1 has been reviewed: age range, mean age $\pm$ standard deviation have been included. 6-The detection of only one specie by microscopy, the non-evaluation of knowledge of participants on malaria prevention, the inability to obtain enough venous blood to give adequate anticoagulant/blood ratio from some participants and the fact that we did not investigate the influence of other infections on anaemia are some of the limits mentioned in the MS. 7 References have been reviewed according to Author guidelines by Sciencedomain International and highlighted in yellow.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		