



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_44893
Title of the Manuscript:	Malaria infection, Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of persons patronizing drugstores for malaria treatment in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, 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, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors have raised an important key points to be addressed for the achievement of the sustainable development Goals on malaria. However, there are some clarifications to be provided as well as the improvement of document to be done. Line 53: the reference number of ethical approval should be provided. Line 70: The reference of the formula using for the sample size determination should be provided. Results: In this section the major concerns are: 1- The urge number of tables which should be combined. From 10 tables the authors may combine the information into 4 tables: - The actual Table 1 should be eliminated since the important information's are already in the text; - All information found in table 2, 3, 4 may be put in one table; - Tables 5 and 6 should be combined; - Tables 7 and 8 should be combined; - Tables 9 and 10 should be combined. 2- The fact that one participant could respond to more than one characteristics, increasing thus the total number of responders, a brief description on how to number the responders should be done in data analysis section. Lines 151: The number does not matched with those in the table. Lines 171-172: number to be checked. Lines 194-196: These proportions are ambiguous for me since they have been interviewed at drug store places the opposite results were expected (World should be modified to would). Discussion: Lines 235: references of researchers should be added. A separated conclusion should be drawn. References: The authors should be conform to some journal abbreviations. Missing sections: The instruction to authors should be followed by adding missing sections such as competing interest, acknowledgments etc...	
Minor REVISION comments	In general, the instruction to authors should be followed in term of formatting the document. Line 45: presentation of references to check. Line 95-96: the numbers should be well placed. Line 107: just to remove the point before (Fig 1) Line 157: Please put Table 2 in bracket or change the sentence formulation. Lines 155-167: the format should be corrected. Line 180: the LLITN used firstly should be totally written. Lines 203-208: the format should be corrected.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The RDT and microscopy have been done. However I have not noticed the impact of these tests in this population. In case of negative results using immediately the RDT, have the authors advised the clients do not take antimalarials?	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> The reference of ethical approval and patients consent should be provided	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pembe Issamou Mayengue
Department, University & Country	Marien Ngouabi University, Congo