SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_35340**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Prevalence of Malaria Infection Among Patients Attending the Health Centre of the Federal University of Technology, Akure, 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, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• Background is inadequate and requires that you briefly indicate some of the factors that account for malaria prevalence and control measures put in place to curb the disease in Nigeria. Secondly, since your data was also collected with respect to season, I suggest you succinctly (a paragraph) summarize some of the studies conducted on the seasonal effect of malaria. • What are the motivations for this study? What are the gaps, which you are trying to fill? All these should be captured in the introduction. • Figure 1a and 1b: This shows monthly distribution of malaria, rainfall and temperature. What tool did you use to determine the relationship and trend between these variables? Please you cannot use the Chi-square test. This is more like regression and trend analysis. Please use the correct tool for such analysis. • Prevalence with respect to these variables (e.g. age, gender, season etc) can be under a presentable table instead of the different pie- charts. • Tables and figures should be put under their respective headings and rephrase the sentence at line 84. • It would have been interesting to also calculate the parasite density with respect to these variables. Please consider	All comments by the reviewer have been noted and all necessary corrections have been effected.
Minor REVISION comments	• Line 33: You made mention of five species of *plasmodium* however, only four were indicated. Please insert the fifth species. • Line 64: How was positive slides differentiated from negative ones? • Line 55: Ethical clearance section should come before the references. Please remove from here. • Line 10: you mentioned that the duration of the study was from Jan-Dec. 2015 however at Line 63: you stated differently that the collection was done from January 2015 to December 2016. Please insert the correct time • Please you did not do species identification so why the statement at **line 150?** Please reconstruct it. • Incorrect sentences e.g. line 158. Please check and correct all.	
Optional/General comments	This paper could be good but lack sufficient data information's and again results were not presented well. Secondly, some parts of the analysis were not performed using the appropriate statistical tool (e.g. are Figure 1a and 1b). The Author should address the issues outlined above.	