

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Zoology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_82611
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Malaria and Associated Risk Factors among Pregnant Women attending Antenatal care in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria</b>
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:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy> )

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>1- Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abstract is presented as a single paragraph without subsections which make it somewhat unclear. Authors should consider to reorganise the abstract.</li> <li>- A better description of methods, especially the key points of the study design may ensure a better understanding.</li> <li>- Abbreviations should be described at the first use.</li> <li>- Key words are absent from the abstract.</li> </ul> <p><b>2- Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The references used in the introduction range from 2001 to 2015; in consequence, background and information presented may be not really up to date and fail to situate the study in the present-day context. Authors should consider a revision of the introduction.</li> <li>- The introduction lacks current data on the prevalence of malaria among pregnant women in the study area and/or in Nigeria.</li> <li>- The geographical description of the study area is not much relevant in the introduction section. It may be summarised and moved to the "Material and methods" section.</li> </ul> <p><b>3- Methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no heading to introduce the methodology of the study. Authors should consider to add a "Material and methods" heading and organise the points 3.1 to 3.6 as sub-headings.</li> <li>- Ethical considerations are not mentioned in the methodology. Authors should state if they obtained ethic clearance from an ethic board, signed informed consent from participants and how they have managed all ethical issues related to such a study.</li> <li>- The sample description is incomplete: There is no details on selection criteria, on the sample size and sample size determination method as well as on the sampling method.</li> <li>- There is no information on the study type and design.</li> <li>- Authors mention the use of a structured questionnaire, but they give very few details on the type of data collected through the questionnaires.</li> <li>- Data analysis method is poorly described. It lacks details on variables of interest (the dependent variables); how they were defined, how they are presented and how they were analysed. Also, the level of significance chosen by the authors is not stated.</li> </ul> <p><b>4- Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authors should consider to first present a summary of the study population's characteristics (mean age, age groups distribution, level of education, main occupation, stage of pregnancy etc.).</li> <li>- Authors should consider to harmonize the presentation of tables throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>- Authors did not presented the overall prevalence of malaria in the study population as a main result in the "results" section and yet, the aim of the study is to determine the prevalence of malaria and associated factors.</li> <li>- Data presentation is unclear and confusing on tables 1 to 4, partly because authors did not defined their dependent variables. It appears that they are two separate dependent variables: "Malaria status", with two possible outcomes (negative/positive) and intensity of infection with three possible outcomes (mild/moderate/severe). The table should present the two outcomes of the first dependant variables, as well as the p-value (or p-value and <math>X^2</math> value) of each chi square test. For example in table 1, authors must have performed one chi 2 test comparing the distribution of "Malaria status" according to age group and another chi 2 test comparing the distribution of "Intensity of infection" according to age group, each test with its p-value and <math>X^2</math> value that need to appear in the table.</li> </ul> <p><b>5- Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The References used by the authors to support explanation of their results in the discussion were all published at least 7 years ago. Some information presented may be no more relevant. If there are no recent data on the subject, authors should explain and provide evidence.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<b>6- Conclusion</b> The manuscript presents no conclusion.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript may need English language editing.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Solange Dabou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Dschang, Cameroon</b>