



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_28884
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the Plasmodium falciparum infection intensity and two methods of malaria diagnosis in North Western Nigeria.
Type of the 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	There were a number of areas where the paper could be strengthened. The manuscript should be edited by a native English speaker as there are several areas that are difficult to read and ambiguous as currently written. I would also suggest expanding the discussion section. The methods section needs to be greatly expanded and improved. It is unclear as to what the authors consider the Gold standard to be for malaria diagnosis in this paper as they report microscopy sensitivities. Methods should include this information. Clarification is also required regarding whether this study is looking at parasitemia prevalence or disease prevalence. Although the states were randomly selected, how were the 'participants' selected? Was RDT missing clinical cases of malaria or just patients with low level parasitemia? This is critical to the point of the paper. I think this may be an important study but the few issues as noted above need to be addressed	Agreed there were some spellings and grammatical mistakes in the write up, but that does not mean only a native English speaker can correct them. The discussion section has been expanded and improved. For selection of the participants we used authoritative sampling. Where all consenting outpatients who were diagnosed with malaria from the selected health facilities were used in the study. Microscopy is regarded as the gold standard method of malaria diagnosis, is stated in the introduction. The RDTs due to their low sensitivity are able to capture only cases with high parasitaemia intensities and those with low parasite intensity are left out. The study is looking at parasitaemia prevalence and intensity in comparison with two methods of diagnosis.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		