

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_124033
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Screening of Glucose-6- Phosphate Dehydrogenase Deficiency Among P. Falciparum Infected Children in Kaduna North Local Government Area of Kaduna State
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>As manuscript title molecular screening of G6PD deficiency in P.falciparum cases. Please mention: Is the genetic variants mentioned in result section has high rates in in P.falciparum cases? Any effect on medical treatment? Any selective advantage in malaria</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>In whole manuscript G6PD deficiency has been mentioned. Molecular screening and its importance in P.falciparum cases not mentioned. So title appears inappropriate.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>In abstract molecular screening of G6PD not mentioned and its importance in P.falciparum cases.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Needs revisions. In introduction only G6pd deficiency and its outcome has been written but in P.Falciparum cases not mentioned and Why molecular screening should be done in P.falciparum cases. In sample collection : only precession biomedical mentioned . how many samples sent for PCR- NOT mentioned. In PCR which kit used ? how many primers used to detect mutants and wild type of G6PD. In screening : Molecular methods not mentioned. How DNA sequence variation done-should be mentioned. In results : only 4 samples out of 33 shown and bands shown which is not clear.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Manuscript needs revisions because molecular screening not clearly mentioned in P.falciparum cases, only molecular screening results shown which is not clear.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>Ref: Benedikt L., Mohammad S.A., James J., O'Donnell, Mohammad S.H., Mohammad Gola m Kibria, Nusrat Jahan, Wasif A Khan, Kamala Thriemer, Mark D Chatfield, Ric N Price and Jack S Richards (2017). A comparison of three quantitative methods to estimate G6PD activity in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh <i>Public Library of Science</i> 25(1)12 -----Link not found on google</p> <p>Andy S., Xin Y.S., Siaw T.Y., Nor A.M., Lee P.C., and Hock H.C.(2002)The mystery of 'saturation gap' and falsely normal G6PD: a case of primaquine-induced haemolysis in <i>Plasmodium vivax</i> malaria infection <i>Clinical Royal College of physicians Edinburgh</i> .51:146-8-----2021 year-needs correction.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Article needs revisions	
Optional/General comments	In summary author mentioned only G6PD deficiency in malaria cases. Which is known deficiency.it has not been mentioned why they are detecting mutations .what is role of mutants in p.falciparum cases.Any impact on treatment of p.falciparum cases. Some genetic variants have reached a high incidence rate in people from certain parts of the world since they present with a selective advantage against malaria .	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Smita Sharma
Department, University & Country	VIMS, India