



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_48512
Title of the Manuscript:	Blood Cell Profiles of Malaria Patients Attending Gaya General Hospital, Kano State, Northern 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Line 72: Specify how sample size was determined. What formula you used to define your sample size at 150 individuals. ▪ Line 79: Specify the ID number of your ethical approval. ▪ Lines 110-116: Specify the brand of the RDT used for malaria diagnosis as well as its panel detection score based on WHO studies on diagnostic performances of RDTs. ▪ Lines 129: The authors have to first present all sociodemographic and clinic data of patients included in the study (gender distribution, age distribution, mean age, signs and symptoms etc.) ▪ Tables 1 and 2 can be merge into one ▪ Tables 4 and 5 can be merge into one ▪ Tables 6 and 7 can be merge into one ▪ Data from Table 3 must be presented properly and comparisons with regard to sex made using the unpaired t test ▪ The authors have to quantify effect size using logistic regression to refine findings from Tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 ▪ Lines 136-164: Make structured paragraphs to present this section of the manuscript ▪ Lines 137-139: The authors have to perform t test to compare mean values ▪ Lines 142-145: The authors have to perform t test to compare mean values ▪ Lines 158-162: The authors have to perform t test to compare mean values ▪ Lines 190-197 These lines are useless; so delete them ▪ Lines 198-204: Add bibliographic references to support your assumptions about the study area ▪ Lines 208-209: You said "The findings in this study further indicated lack of influence of age of the subjects on the prevalence of malaria" 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>I think your explanation is wrong as you sample size is very small (just 20 patients aged 1-10 years). So, you have to specify it as possible cause to the fact that you did not find any statistically significant difference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lines 210-215: These lines are useless; so delete them ▪ Lines 229-309: Please just discuss statistically significant results. Your discussion is too long for nothing and as a result is very boring ▪ You have to specify the main limitations of the study. For instance, you did not look for any other cause for changes in blood parameters as nutritional status (malnutrition) or other blood cells-changing infectious diseases or disorders ▪ Lines 326-417: All bibliographic references have to be presented as per guidelines of the IJTDH ▪ Lines 17-23: This lines of the abstract must be rewritten as more robust statistical analysis (logistic regression) to be performed to improve the quality of significance of the study ▪ The sections “Acknowledgments” and “Funding” are missing in the manuscript ▪ Globally, the authors should also improve the quality of scientific writing of this manuscript because the style used for writing the paper is not fluent. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Loick Pradel Kojom
Department, University & Country	The University of Douala, Cameroon