



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	Line 57; Ethics number needs to be provided; explain how consent was obtained, and who provided it for blood collection from children. Line 59; what was the sample size? What was the collection rate? Did all patients have blood samples taken or a sample of the greater population? Tabulate the sample i.e. the number breakdown per age group - showing 1-10 year olds what % they were of the total; students; staff; who gave consent for the collection of blood from the one to ten year olds? They cannot consent for themselves? This needs to be very clear please. How did the researchers obtain access to the patients and their blood; who took the blood? How did you do the random sampling? Please remember that other researchers will want to replicate your study, so you have to give them as much data as possible to do this. I also do not see any information on how you determined validity and reliability in this study? Line 35; Please explain which part of the globe is being referred to? Line 44; Please give readers an idea of how many deaths occur annually in Nigeria, Africa and the world and how many are caused by Malaria? Line 54; Please describe the health Centre briefly Line 85; what % of total patients was the 2616? Line 93; which months? Are your referring to October and November? Line 96; what percentage were the male and female patients of the total of 2616? Line 100; what status are you referring to? Line 101; what percentage were the students of the total of 2616? Line 102; what percentage were the staffs of the total of 2616? Line113 & 115; what % of total were tested for Malaria parasites? Line 158; poor drainage of what? Line 161; what is a high prevalence? Please explain and give a number? Line 174 to 179; this genotype sentence needs further explanation please; remember lay people may read this manuscript and will not understand? Line 180; please explain why female patients may have been at higher risk than male patients? Line 187; explain this please? I would think that students would not be able to afford mosquito nets? But staff most likely can? Line 196; teenagers may be protected by parents by having mosquito nets? Line 199; older people may be more aware/better educated of needing protection? Can afford to have mosquito nets? The conclusion needs to be rewritten please What were the limitations of this study?	All comments by the reviewer have been noted and all necessary corrections have been effected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The authors do not make clear who gave consent for blood samples to be obtained from the children, or how they obtained this consent - Ethics approval number should be included in the manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please see the 'bubbles' on the PdF document provided for editing corrections. Too numerous to write in this provided space. Sorry! please place the illustrations in the correct position in the text	All comments in the Pdf file have been noted and all the necessary corrections have been effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodology needs to be much clearer than it is. My suggestion is that this manuscript be corrected and resubmitted for peer review. I am happy to review it once the corrections have been completed following resubmission. Turnitin similarity index of 12%; Turnitin report included in review https://www.turnitin.com/newreport.asp?eq=1&eb=1&esm=-1&oid=830273423&m=0&svr=301&r=53.09185022932059&lang=en_us&bypass_cv=1	