

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_93126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Kidney Complication of Severe Malaria</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy> )

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Title:</b> The title is to be reframed as follows: <b>Complications of kidney in severe malaria.</b></p> <p>There is more than one complication associated with severe malaria cases or cases as contained in the text.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> It is succinct of kidney complications from severe malaria infection-acute form.</p> <p>A few botanical names weren't written in italics The words to be rewritten are in red ink.</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> It is fairly okay. The part to be corrected has been commented on.</p> <p><b>Introductions:</b> It gives a vivid outlook of the title. It is good.</p> <p>A few botanical names not written in italics The words are to be rewritten in red ink.</p> <p>Body of the text: The front and the size aren't as per the journal standard. From pathogenesis to the various stages of distinct complications are too much. It could be reframed accordingly. The subsections are in order.</p> <p>From the context of the text, this is a mere academic exercise from the theoretical point of view. It highlights the complications that engulf the kidney in a severe malaria case(s)'. It wasn't written as per the stratification of the journal even though it isn't outright research or documentation from the record of such cases. Botanical names weren't written as per the standard as highlighted in red ink to be corrected.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion should be pinpointed for ease of grasp by the readers. It is too wordy</p> <p><b>References in the text:</b> Its citations in the text are okay. But, it is too many. It should be streamlined to not more than 30.</p> <p><b>References list:</b> References in the references section or list are too many. This isn't a review write-up. It should be streamlined to 30 references at most. The written references didn't follow the journal style. Adding a website where the references could be obtained besides the journal details isn't necessary at all as long as journal details are available. It should be rewritten accordingly</p> <p><b>Acknowledgment:</b> It wasn't written.</p> <p>The words or groups of words in red ink are to be corrected.</p> <p>The words or groups of words in yellow ink are the peer-reviewed comments.</p> <p>The words or groups of words in blue ink are the corrections made by the peer-reviewed.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is theoretical academic exercise with its importance. It is good for people to know about huge problems the acute malaria causes in humans.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Peter Shaba</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>College of Agriculture, Nigeria</b>