



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_32599
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON AND EVALUATION OF ASYMPTOMATIC MALARIA PARASITAEMIA AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING SPECIALISTS HOSPITAL, SOKOTO, NORTH-WESTERN, 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I find that this manuscript is interesting and the content is important information. However, I have some comments. INTRODUCTION. Line 41. I lack a reference. MATERIALS AND METHODS. I think that the presentation of data sometimes can be reorganized. The sample size is presented four times in the manuscript, and I do not think that this is necessary. All abbreviations should be explained the first time that these are written. This is not the case for abbreviations such as ANC and PCV. Line 185. What type of validation did the expert panel? Face validity, content validity...? RESULTS. Line 204, 206 and 210. The prevalence is confirmed as higher, but there is no significant difference. I think that this needs to be explained, because in my opinion there is no difference if there is no significance. DISCUSSION. Line 279-280. I think that this statement needs to be explained. Why is this information important?	-Line 41 reference Ref. (WHO,2011) had been cited. -Is noted and correction effected -questionnaire content validity - there was no statistically significant difference (p- value = 0.128, this might be due to sample size being too small) - This might probably be explained that the protective immunity of the African women to malaria parasitaemia might not be as a result of parity
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		