

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_103397 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Comparative Analysis in Utilizing Different Diagnostic Methods for Plasmodium Falciparum Detection within Owerri Municipal |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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) |
|---|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | 1. The manuscript is relevant for scientific community, particularly because is presenting the challenge of many developing countries, where does not exist the enough quantity of resources to achieve a molecular diagnostic in a lot of infectious diseases and the researcher needs turn more efficient their diagnostic tools. 2. The title of the article is totally suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensible, and it gives us enough information about the aim and the methods of the paper 4. The subsections are appropriated, but the authors can enhance the relationship of different diagnosis tools and the clinical behaviour of the disease to emphasize in their utility. 5. Yes it is scientifically correct 6. Yes they are enough and support in an adequate way the scientific basis of the article | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | 1. It is desirable the style correction for a native English reviewer. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Luz Ma. Adriana Balderas Peña |
| Department, University & Country | UMAЕ Hospital de Especialidades Centro Médico Nacional de Occidente del, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, Centro Universitario de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad de Guadalajara, México |