



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	1. The methodology in the Abstract should be reviewed 2. In the body of the write up, in line 83-85 the sentences should be reviewed 3. Statements about the schools used may be re writing. The researcher may not bother to include names in lines 62-64 4. In Laboratory Methods, line113, give the method used 5. In the discussion the statements in lines 199-202 should appear in the results 6. In line 207, 212, 213, method of referencing is not followed	1. The methodology have been reviewed as instructed with the opening sentence deleted 2. The sentences have reviewed. 3. Statements about schools have been rewritten with names of schools deleted and just the different locations highlighted 4. Name of method stated in Line 109 5. Lines 199-202 have been deleted. It was indeed a repetition of 170-173 6. Method of referencing adjusted accordingly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1. Generally, the prevalence of malaria recorded by the researcher is high considering the fact that the infection is subclinical or asymptomatic. Only slide microscopy was done, besides the fact that the researcher failed to show whether it was thin or thick smear, the researcher failed to confirm the positivity of the slide microscopy with PCR method. Also, the researcher did not show clearly how many people examined the slides hence the high prevalence of 48% of malaria in subclinical population may not be real. It should be borne in mind that the researched proved that the population were treated with anti helminths twice. In a population where this is done, one may think that the knowledge of malaria and prevention could be high.	1. The prevalence of malaria according to the study is 38.4% as indicated in table 2 and not 48%. The necessary corrections have been made that addresses the worries raised like the number of people who examined malaria and stool slides. The prevalence of geohelminths was 19.8% and not that of malaria

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	