

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_97282
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Plasmodium Falciparum Malaria on the Conductivity and Viscosity of Sudanese Patients' Blood
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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>[Note 1] The study is important for society, especially in Africa, as it is another indicator of the disease through an easily accessible and low-cost test.</p> <p>[Note 2] The title of the study is in accordance with what was proposed by the authors, and its objective is already implied.</p> <p>[Note 3] The authors were happy to highlight the state of the art in the abstract, making clear the justification and methodology from the beginning.</p> <p>[Note 4] The sub items of the study bring a descriptive chronology of the experimental process and highlight through equations the concepts that were not exemplified.</p> <p>[Note 5] The study brings new diagnostic practices that can benefit millions of people with a simple test, and further studies in this perspective can be motivated or even the benefit of the same for other diseases.</p> <p>[Note 6] The bibliographical reference is sufficient to complement the statistical study and to assist in the results and discussions, which was satisfactory.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The study presents a simple, yet clear and objective language in the text that reaches most readers as undergraduate students, which can serve as a means of disseminating the diagnostic technique presented in the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The sample size could be larger due to the availability of access, or the high rates of contaminated patients, however it can be considered a more recent data generating study in comparison to the literature and stands out for the novelty of the new technique.</p>	

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:	Thiago Victorino Claus
Department, University & Country	Franciscan University, Brazil