

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJTDH_96056 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Methodological discrepancies of Reports on Plasmodium Falciparum Histidine Rich Protein 2/3 Gene Deletions among African Countries Between January 2010 And December 2021: A Systematic Review |
| Type of the Article | 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:

(<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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Systematic Review deals with an important topic, <i>P. falciparum</i> histidine rich protein 2/3 gene deletions (Pfhrp2/3gd) that could lead to misdiagnosis of malaria, which could lead to catastrophic results for many patients in Africa. • The title is suitable. • The abstract of the article is comprehensive. • The structure of the manuscript appropriate. • The manuscript is scientifically correct. • The references are sufficient and recent. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | The language/English quality of the article is suitable. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the table: 10a-----what does "a" refer to? • <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i>-----should be italicized. | |

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name: | Ayman A Allam |
| Department, University & Country | Zagazig University, Egypt |