



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_45212
Title of the Manuscript:	Malaria and geohelminthiasis: their prevalence and impact on iron stores parameters of school aged children 5 to 10 years in the Buea Municipality, Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	A summary of the laboratory methods used should be written in addition to the referenced details Please state the confidence intervals for your results Please read through and edit all grammatical errors Correct tenses and be consistent in their use	The summary of the laboratory results have been written as instructed by the reviewers. However it is worth noting that the methods were summarily elaborated in sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2. After this correction, i have deleted these sections to avoid repetition. Confidence interval stated as requested The work has re-read with kin attention to the editing of grammatical errors. Tenses have been corrected and have ensured that it is consistent
Minor REVISION comments	General coordinates of the study site may be included in the description of the schools sampled	One of the reviewers requested that the school names be deleted. General coordinates of the study site have been included as requested
Optional/General comments	The conclusion should not contain a repetition of the results. It should be a consequence of your findings. There is no evidence for the authors recommendation in the conclusion from their findings "If massive iron supplementation must be carried281 out, it should only be done in areas where the two parasitic infection prevention is strictly282 implemented, iron can provide an enabling environment for the parasite to thrive or the body283 can sequester it in the storage compartment which may lead to haemochromatosis" Authors may want to rephrase. Authors may want to refer to the "group" of infection instead of "state" of infection for clarity	The results that were repeated have been deleted. The conclusion has been rephrased. Changes have been made as suggested

PART 2:

	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)
--	--------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> There is no statement of ethical approval being obtained from a recognised Ethical Review Board. Authors should state approval given by recognized Ethical approval awarding body for studies involving human subjects	Included as requested. Thanks
--	--	-------------------------------