

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_129518
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimalarial Susceptibility Profile of Plasmodium falciparum Isolated from Human Population in Selected Health Facilities in Keffi Metropolis, Nasarawa State, Nigeria
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think this manuscript has some importance to the public health field as it tried to evaluate the prevalence of malaria and its resistance to standard therapeutics in study area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The manuscript title looks appropriate.	
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.	The article abstract looks appropriate but the abbreviation RDT should be explained.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript looks correct from scientific perspective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The used references are sufficient but not all are recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some mistakes in punctuations and spelling should be corrected	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors should consider the following:</p> <p>1- I don't think this is a cross-sectional study, rather it can be considered a descriptive one.</p> <p>2- I think section 3.3 and 3.4 in the results should be combined together.</p> <p>3- The citation style should be unified; authors should check the last paragraph in results and discussion.</p> <p>Authors should declare any competing interests. No ethical issues detected.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq