

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_97697</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Survey in Iranian Malaria blood donation deferral: Laboratory evaluation in Malaria blood donation deferral in the Iranian Blood centers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research 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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1- <b>Yes.</b> The manuscript is important.  2- <b>The title of the article is suitable.</b>  3- <b>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</b>  4- <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</b>  5- <b>Yes. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b>  6- <b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1- The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1- The author has not explained the date of this survey. And this survey started and ended on what date? 2- Microscopic diagnosis of Plasmodium species by observing the ring is very difficult. Therefore, it is recommended to avoid naming the species. Especially the molecular results showed that these samples are negative.	

### PART 2:

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abdolhossein Dalimi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tarbiat Modares University, Iran</b>