

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_122781
Title of the Manuscript:	Malaria Parasitaemia Severity and Oxidative Stress Markers in Patients Attending Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, Port Harcourt
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the significant gap in understanding the relationship between malaria parasitaemia and oxidative stress markers in a specific geographic context, namely Port Harcourt, Nigeria. By systematically assessing oxidative stress markers like superoxide dismutase (SOD), total antioxidant status (TAS), total oxidant status (TOS), and oxidative stress index (OSI) in malaria-infected individuals, the study provides valuable insights into the pathophysiology of malaria and its potential impact on oxidative stress. The manuscript's findings, particularly the increased OSI in malaria-positive subjects, highlight a potential link between malaria severity and oxidative stress, which could contribute to developing more targeted therapeutic strategies. I like this manuscript because it provides a detailed and well-structured analysis of the oxidative stress markers, employing robust statistical methods to analyze data.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title of the article is informative and provides a clear overview of the study's focus on malaria parasitaemia and oxidative stress markers in a specific population. However, it could be more concise and engaging to better capture the reader's attention A suggested alternative title could be: "Oxidative Stress Markers in Malaria Patients: Assessing the Impact of Parasitaemia Severity at Rivers State University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria."</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>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive as it provides a clear summary of the study's aim, methodology, results, and conclusion.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections are mostly appropriate and align with standard scientific article formats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •However, it could be beneficial to separate the "Results" and "Discussion" into distinct sections to improve clarity and focus. •There is an error in the subsection numbering under section 2.7 titled "Calculation of Oxidative Stress Index (OSI)." The subsection is incorrectly labeled as 3.7.4, but it should be numbered as 2.7.4 to maintain consistency with the rest of the document. Please this numbering issue should be corrected. •There is a typo error "using" found after the statement "between 18 and 77 years" and before the statement "who indicated interest in the study" under subsection 2.3. Also, a typo error "while" found in the last sentence under section 4 (conclusion). •I noticed that the analysis related to the male control and male parasitemia subjects was not addressed in the discussion section. Including an analysis of these results is important to provide a complete interpretation of the study's findings. •Any abbreviation should be defined. Under subsection 2.7.1.2, TMB was not defined. •Please ensure that all scientific names of microorganisms, including genus and species names, are italicized throughout the manuscript. This is a standard convention in biological and scientific writing. For example, <i>Treponema pallidum</i>, also <i>Plasmodium</i> should be italicized wherever it appears. Correcting this will align the manuscript with proper scientific formatting guidelines. •Discussing mechanisms behind the observed oxidative stress in malaria patients would further strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the field. •The conclusion is concise and summarizes the main findings. It could be strengthened by explicitly stating the broader implications of the findings and recommending specific areas for future research. 	
<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>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear research design and thorough methodology. The use of a cross-sectional study design with well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria ensures that the study population is appropriate and representative. The detailed description of the sample collection, processing, and the specific oxidative stress markers measured (SOD, TAS, TOS, and OSI) using established ELISA techniques adds to the technical soundness of the research. Additionally, the statistical analyses, including the use of ANOVA, t-tests, and Pearson's correlation, are appropriate for the data presented and support the validity of the findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript appear to be largely sufficient and cover a range of relevant sources.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article appear to be generally suitable for scholarly communications	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Falade Ifeoluwa Joy
Department, University & Country	University of Lagos, Nigeria