



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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract <i>Results:</i> reporting of an overall prevalence would seem appropriate before age-specific prevalence. <i>Abbreviations:</i> Not necessary and should be captured in the text unless it is the journal requirement. Introduction Presentation Ok. Where there any previous studies done in the area/locality that might indicate parasite species distribution for comparison in this study? <i>Line 58:</i> Growth should be replaced by "breeding", seem more appropriate <i>Line 63:</i> reference numbers could be abbreviated to 6-10 rather than 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, etc. Methodology <i>Study area:</i> a. s. i needs to be written in full in all instances. <i>Line 81:</i> word <u>earth</u> should be replaced with appropriate wording to describe road condition	We agree with the reviewer. Abstract The overall prevalence (35.5%, 183) has been mentioned before age specific prevalence in the abstract. Agreed. Abbreviations have been deleted. Other studies that were carried out in nearby areas have been mentioned. However, no similar study has been done in this particular area. "Growth" has been changed to "breeding" Reference numbers in text have been abbreviated as instructed where need be. Agreed The abbreviation 'a.s.l' has been written in full: "above sea level" The word "earth" has been replaced with "untarred"



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 117: should be <u>artesunate-amodiaquine combination</u>. 2.7 Laboratory analysis: no mentioned of thick film/smear in the text Results The overall prevalence not clearly provided the MS. A graph show relationship of malaria prevalence with age would seem more meaningful. 3.2 Prevalence and density Line 172: more appropriate to have 1989 parasites/μL and 1944 parasites/μL would be more appropriate than just figures. 3.5 Haematological indices..... Line 222-223: the letter U – what does it mean? Table 2: Word in columns are far apart needs to bring them	The word “combination” has been added to artesunate-amodiaquin. In order to avoid repetition, we mentioned thick and thin blood smears under the sub-title “Sample collection” to reflect the order in which the activities were carried out since they were prepared in the field immediately after each blood sample was collected. The overall prevalence is mentioned in line 4 of section 3.1: “Characteristics of the study population” We felt that a graph to show relationship between malaria prevalence with age will be a repetition of what is presented in “Table 2” which is contrary to prescriptions of the journal which state that different figures or tables should not be used to present same data. 3.2 Prevalence and density: Parasites /μL has been added to the figures 3.5 Haematological indices U is the Mann Whitney statistical U test for comparing means of parasite densities as mentioned in the “statistical analyses” and further defined below table 2. Words in columns have been adjusted.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	close together especially top row column 3 and column 2 half way down. Discussion Ok	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	General Comments An important study for the local region. The MS is well written. However, few minor corrections are needed or should be considered. • Where CI are reported it would be more informative that to mention 95% CI – not just CI. • Where <i>plank</i> houses are written should be replaced by <i>wooden</i> houses or <i>timber</i> houses would be more appropriate. • Words like <i>block</i> replace with <i>brick houses</i> • Community awareness campaign would be more appropriate than the word education – Line 32 in the Abstract and elsewhere. • In the discussion limitation of the study should be mentioned. For example: only one species were detected with microscopy. • See specific comments under different sections of MS.	Note was taken and changes have been effected where necessary and highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.