



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_28518
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Participation in Malaria Control and Prevention in Abia State, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) The aim of the manuscript seems unclear. From the title and the discussion section it appears that the objective of the present study is to evaluate the effect of community participation on malaria control; however, none of the conducted surveys fall in this context. The data collected evaluates the level of knowledge, attitude and practices against malaria only without showing any impact of community participation on the disease control strategy. 2) For the study to fulfil its aim, the effect of community participation on the progress of the malaria disease should be evaluated by conduction case studies and comparing knowledge, attitude and practices against malaria prior and post community participation. In this presented form, the work appears simply describing the knowledge of a studied population about the malaria disease and adds nothing to what is already known about the public's knowledge on Malaria especially in the Sub-Saharan African countries and to what was previously done in Ayelewu, Bamidele, and Ezeigbo's work. 3) The authors jump into broad conclusions by claiming that "the data obtained will help in strengthening community involvement in	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	malaria eradication....” lines 91-92. How so? 4) In the results section, the exact same results are presented twice; once in the form of a table and another as wordings...no need for such a repetition.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Weak sentence structure. Improper usage of terminologies like “magnitude of the work”, “far from perfect”, “hardest hit”, “see the merits”.... 2) Sentences are too long; more than one important idea is raised in one sentence. 3) Redundancy in ideas and wordings throughout the manuscript. 4) Link and transitions are missing between paragraphs. 5) The manuscript requires rewriting and further revision by a native English speaker if possible. 6) The map should be cited in the text as figure 1 in line 96. 7) In line 36, avoid the use of apostrophe in people! 8) Reference # 5 shouldn't be in bold in the reference list.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Layla kamareddine
Department, University & Country	Harvard Medical School-Boston Children's Hospital, USA