



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_45337
Title of the Manuscript:	Sickle cell disease and severity of malaria
Type of the Article	Short 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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. Line 104, 105,106: "In fact, 71.32% (92/335) of sickle cell patients had severe malaria due to anaemia. Only 2.33% (3/146) had convulsions. Question: In line 12, line 79 and line 96, we are told 974 malaria patients were included in the study. Line 98 says (129/974) of patients were sickle cell patients. Line 101 says (103/129) of sickle cell patients had severe malaria. Where is the (92/335) in lines 104, 105 and 106 come from? Is that statement (92/335) been inferred from this research manuscript or is a reference been quoted from another source. If the later is the case, then I suppose a citation must be supplied, otherwise the (92/335) is very confusion to me. I really don't know where its coming from. Its really needs to be clarify before this manuscript is put out to the public. 2. Lines 91 to 93: The relative risk (RR) between sickle cell disease and severe malaria factors on the one hand and sickle cell disease and risk of death on the other hand were calculated. Question: Could the "how" of that calculation be provided to the reviewer? How is that RR calculated? Based on what? Is it just by counting the number of SS patient with severe malaria (or anaemia) who died during the study period or what? I just need clarification to satisfy my curiosity. 3. Line 127 (RR = 0.5, p=0.05), line 133 (RR = 5, p = 0.2) Question: It looks like the RR values in those lines (lines 127 and 133) are not the same as in the table (line 119). The values in the table needs to be well arranged.	In fact, 73.64% (95/129) of sickle cell patients had severe anemia, 3.88% (5/129) convulsions and others (22,48%). OK: It is an error during data analyze. I corrected it 974 patients was infected with Plasmodium, of witch 129 have sickle cell disease 103 with severe malaria of wtch 99 have SS hemoglobin 4 have SC hemoglobin 35 are dead of malaria of witch 4 deaths have sickle cell disease 3 deaths have SS hemoglobin 1 deaths have SC hemoglobin Relative risk (RR) is a statistical measure often used in epidemiology, measuring the risk of an event occurring in one group compared to the other. This is the ratio of risk between the two groups (exposed vs. unexposed) Yes/ I correct it
Minor REVISION comments	Line 50: "...subjects against salaria" . I think there is a typo error there. Should be "malaria" and not "salaria" Line 76 and 77: "She was taken to paediatric services A and B of Niamey National Hospital". The whole of that sentence/statement does not make any meaning and connection to the statement before (line 75) to me. Lines 76 and 77 come out from nowhere? What does sentence mean and where does it come from?? Lines 138 and 139: Haemoglobin is on one hand the main component of red blood cells and allows the supply of tissues and organs in oxygen. The statement does not sound OK to me. Especially the last part...."and allows the supply of tissue and organs in oxygen."	OK OK The study was conducted at the pediatric services A and B of Niamey National Hospital. Lines 138 and 139: OK I rephrase this sentence
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is generally OK. However, I wish those typos in the minor comments session and the concerns I have raised in the major comment session needs to be looked at. Thank you.	OK

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	You have the authorisation of the university and the NNH