



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_37884
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF MALARIA PARASITAEMIA IN THREE SELECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS OF NIGER STATE, NORTH CENTRAL, NIGERIA
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>)



[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	Abstract The abstract is too long and will benefit from some brevity. • Reduce some of the background information. • Lines 15 – 18 and lines 25 – 27 are not necessary, delete. • Lines 23 – 24: was the difference significant? Was there a significant association between malaria prevalence and age? That also applies to the results section. • Line 23: also present the 95% confidence limit of the overall prevalence of malaria. This also applies to the results section. • State the exact p-values and not $p < 0.05$. This should be corrected throughout the manuscript. • Lines 30 – 32: who had a higher prevalence, subjects who lived in thatched-roof houses or those who lived in houses with corrugated iron roofing sheets? Introduction • Lines 60 – 66: Get the latest WHO estimates of the burden of malaria. Methods • When was the study performed? What was the duration of the study? • Specify the criteria that were used to select these study sites. Selecting 3 out of 25 LGA is not representative. Some study sites should be selected in the East of Niger state area as well. • Is there data on the entomological inoculation rate in the different study sites? • Describe the study population. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria? How were participants sampled from the entire population? What was done to ensure representativeness of sample? • Describe how the data obtained was analysed clearly stating the statistical tests used. Results This section is poorly presented and needs to be reorganised. There is a lot of duplication of information in the results. • Start with a description of the demographic characteristics. Lines 179 – 181 needs to be presented here as well. Also describe the study population in the different study sites using table if appropriate. I.e. present the age and gender distribution of the participants stratified according to study sites. • Lines 136 – 140: duplicity of information; all the data presented here also appears in table 1. • For all tables, include the percentages for all cell entries. Also complete or delete the "Negative" columns for tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. • Table 2: was malaria prevalence associated with gender? Perform an appropriate test to measure the association. • Lines 148 – 151: see comment for lines 136 – 140. Was malaria prevalence associated with age? • Table 3 and figure 2 conveys the same information, delete one of them. • Lines 181 – 183: was the difference significant? • It will be interesting to know how the malaria parasite density (parasitaemia) varies with age, gender and the different study sites.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Abstract • Lines 23 -24: do you mean “Interviewer-administered for those who could not read and write?” • Line 31: change “discovered” to “observed” Methods • Line 104: “Ethical <u>approval</u> was sought...” Discussion • Lines 238 – 240: paragraph is made up of just 1 sentence. Combine this with the preceding paragraph. References The references and citations in the text need to be presented in the format prescribed by the journal. • The following references appear in the reference section but are not cited in the text: ✓ Okafor and Oko-Ose, 2012 ✓ Ukpai and Ajoku, 2001 • Three references for WHO (2007) have been used and needs to be clearly differentiated. • Check ref 3, it seems to be combined with another. • Ter et al. (2003) is cited in the text but is not listed in the references.	
Optional/General comments	The author(s) seek to determine the prevalence of malaria in 3 Local Government areas (LGA) in the Niger state of Nigeria. Data are mostly descriptive. The major weakness of the manuscript is the study design; selecting only 3 sites out of the 25 LGA is not representative of the situation of malaria in the Niger state and so conclusion cannot be drawn from this. Furthermore, the presentation of the manuscript is poor, particularly the methods and results, and needs to be re-organised adding to it the missing information pointed out in the specific comments above. Generally we reserve malaria parasitaemia to mean parasite density, simply refer to as prevalence of malaria throughout the manuscript. More so, there a lot of grammatical errors that will need to be corrected before the manuscript is fit for publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tebit Emmanuel Kwent</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Buea, Cameroon</i>