

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_74520
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Intensity of Malaria Parasite infection among under Five Children: a Case Study of Dunukofia rural Community in Anambra State, Nigeria
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Prevalence and Intensity of Malaria Parasite infection among under Five Children: case study of Dunukofia rural Community in Anambra State, Nigeria</p> <p>The prevalence was described in the study but the severity of cases were not mentioned in the study. So the title should be corrected. Type of study should be mentioned in the title. the retrospective malaria status of the children in the communities was gotten from the population's medical files. why retrospective data is used when blood sample is collected for microscopy?</p> <p>They were visited once every week for three months. does this mean some patients tested more than 1 time?</p> <p>Collection of Blood Samples: Blood samples were collected from malaria symptomatic and asymptomatic children aged 0 – 14.9 months with the professional help of a laboratory scientist.</p> <p>..... but the inclusion criteria was under five yr old children, then why upto 14.9 months? How the sample size is calculated? Why only 301 patient were tested? Why some patient tested by RDT and some by microscopy?</p> <p>Table were labeled as amongst children 0 -14 months. but the inclusion criteria was under five yr old children.</p> <p>Scale is wrong in this chart. There are only 150 patients, but chart showing 300 patients infected in RDT category and similar number in the other category also.</p> <p>Overall, more malaria infections were detected by RDT (303, 74.3%) when compared to microscopy (105, 25.7%). in discussion part the authors wrote The result of positive test distribution by microscopy and Rapid Diagnostic Test in this study revealed that more malaria infections were detected by RDT (303, 66.9%) when compared to microscopy (105, 23.3%). The author were not consistent about the number of patient tested. There were 151 patient in RDT group and 150 in microscopy group. If these patients were different then how its commented that more patients detected by RDT?</p> <p>Discussion : The disparity in the prevalence may be counterparts the fact the males are more outdoor players than their female counterparts..... then why more female were detected in RDT test?</p> <p>Conclusion :</p> <p>Age and gender as well as the use of ITN had a significant effect on the prevalence of Malaria in this study. [how gender as its different for different test]</p> <p>The usefulness and reliability of RDT kits for malaria diagnosis in the absence of expert microscopy is also reinforced. [how they knew that RDT is reliable?]</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dunukaofia, Anamba State, Nigeria. This was already mentioned in the title and material and methods. So no need of frequent repetition at multiple places. 2. Need of spelling correction in introduction part: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Critically afflicted children often die less than 72 hours after developing symptoms..... b) India accounting for over 120 million slide examinations and globally. 3. Unwanted explanation of demography of the area in methodology part. 4. 2.6 Preparation and examination of Blood Film: The laboratory method employed for staining and identification of malaria parasites in collected blood samples was as described by [6]..... As described by whom????????? Need to put the author name. 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Gouda Ankula Prasad Kartikeswar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>MJM Hospital, India</i>