



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_36787
Title of the Manuscript:	Short Term Outcome of Malaria at Rwanda Level 2 Hospital Bria in Central African Republic: A Cross-sectional study
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>)

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	This is an interesting research study. However, authors forgot most of scientific principles: - Introduction: many statements need better specification as those overlined. Add references appropriately. ie: be consistent with statements in lines 40 to 43 concerning <i>P.ovale</i>. Does Line 50-51 refer to world estimations??? - The methodology section: needs a detailed data collection description. ie: laboratory tests undergone, how the authors classified the parasitaemia, how was clinical examinations carried out. Specify if data source: from patients files or prospectively gathered by investigators. Include also treatment schemes as it appears in the results section. Ethical rules need to be followed: patient information, secured patient informed consent prior to its enrolment. - Results section: there are interesting data but they need to be reorganized. Include tables titles. - Discussion section: this section should not repeat all results data as the authors did. This section highlights main results trends and their significance with comparison whenever possible to finding elsewhere. Table II seems not interesting. Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? As a prospective study, authors should include steps preceding patient enrolment: patient information, patient informed consent secured before enrolment, respect of national malaria treatment schemes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The study highlights clinical, parasitological and treatments pattern of malaria cases among outpatients who attended the Rwanda Level 2 hospital Bria. - <u>The study title needs changes to be adapted to the three aspects of the study.</u> - the methodology needs details in the data collection subsection. Also there is a need of detailed study criteria (inclusion and exclusion), patient information and consent according to international recommendations on research on human being (ICH) prior to its enrolment. - revise discussion; - revise conclusion	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kuete Thomas
Department, University & Country	Department of Biological Sciences, The University of Douala, Cameroon