



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_28057
Title of the Manuscript:	BEYOND DRUGS IN ELIMINATING MALARIA SCOURGE IN NIGERIA; SAILING-UP VECTOR CONTROL STRATEGIES
Type of the Article	Mini-review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The review article outlines an important issue of alternative non chemotherapeutical control of malaria. It mentions Integrated vector control strategies. However, it does not explicitly state a clear suggestion of how this could be achieved. Many chemical agents used for indoor residual spraying and LLITN are also used in other sectors eg agriculture. I would have been clearly stated how the two sectors, health and agriculture could be integrated to jointly address the problem. Further, the feasibility (costs, logistics) and envisaged effectiveness of Community mobilization in controlling the scourge is not clearly argued e.g environmental sanitation needs resources such as equipment, education, training and so on. How will these resources be mobilized in terms of costs, sustainability etc. The conclusion provided is very light in relation to the main aim of the review Line 67-68: Proposition of chemoprophylaxis as suitable alternative to medication is not adequately argued. How is this approach suited to high malaria transmission? What are the associated costs and logistics compared to chemotherapy? Any evidence of where it was adequately successful in endemic areas?	1. This dimension between health and agriculture had been captured. 2. The way to mobilization for cost and logistics has been added 3. The conclusion has been padded to show the relationship to the main aim. 4. Concerning line 67-68 which have now changed due to additional texts, the suitability has been included. However, this article is a mini review and does not intend to go into the in-depth economic evaluations. Section 2.1 has stated some of the areas where chemoprophylaxis have been effective compared to medication use.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are several grammatical issues in the review particularly in the introduction section. E.g. The sentence starting from line 41 to 43 is a fragment statement; The sentence 'It becomes rational that using population protective and preventive methods that places more of the burden on the government might produce better results' utilizes the word 'places' instead of 'place'. It is unclear as to how by placing the burden on the government the proposed strategy will be effective. Statements from line 53 through line 65 have mixed ideas without a logical flow of ideas . This likely because too long statements are used	1. The grammatical errors have been corrected 2. The statement on how placing the burden on the government the proposed strategy will be effective has been clarified 3. Statements from line 53 through line 65 have been rewritten to flow logically
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Strong arguments, focused statements accompanied with facts, and a solid conclusion are all needed to make the review valuable	1. The discussion and conclusion section has been further re-enforced with more facts in line with the reviewers recommendation.