



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46920
Title of the Manuscript:	Complications of Falciparum Malaria Infections among Ghanaian Children; from the Healthcare Personnel's perspective.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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>Abstract</p> <p>Line 9: change "The study was a questionnaire cross sectional one" to "This questionnaire-based cross sectional study was...."</p> <p>Line 13: delete the following sentence "<i>Data analysis was done using excel and SPSS</i>"</p> <p>Line 11 and line 14: These both sentence vehicle the same information. So, delete one of both</p> <p>Line 15: delete this part of sentence "<i>and the remaining (47.5%) were females</i>"</p> <p>Line 16: the sentence must be rather within Materials and Methods section</p> <p>Line 19: change "in the study area" to "by the respondents"</p> <p>Lines 24-25: change the conclusion. Your conclusion is not consistent with objectives of the study. In conclusion, what we can draw from your main findings.</p> <p>Line 27: change the keywords. I propose you the following: Malaria, children, complications, perspective, health personnel, Ghana</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Lines 41-43: it is not clear if it is <i>P. falciparum</i> which is responsible for 44% of all reported cases in Ghana. Indeed, in your previous sentence you specified that this malarial species is the main threat in sub-Saharan Africa.</p> <p>Line 49-52: The problematic is not clear. This sentence makes guess a start of problematic, but however, it is not sufficient to clearly understand why you interested in health personnel. So, you have to develop your idea by stressing on why health personnel would be critical. Please, look at the lines 131-134 of your discussion for having clearer</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Line 9: Authors agree with the reviewer and the change had been made.</p> <p>Line 13: The sentence is deleted</p> <p>Line 11 and 14: Sentence in line 14 has been deleted.</p> <p>Line 15: The sentence is deleted.</p> <p>Line 16: Authors agree with the reviewer and the change had been made</p> <p>Line 19: "in the study area" has been changed to "by the respondent"</p> <p>Lines 24-25: The conclusion has been change to suit the objectives.</p> <p>Line 27: The keywords have been change to "Malaria, children, complications, perspective, health personnel, Ghana"</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Lines 41-43: The authors wanted to state the facts that falciparum malaria is responsible for almost 44% of all reported OPD cases in Ghana since Ghana is endemic to this tropical disease.</p> <p>Line 49-52: Authors are accordance with the reviewer's comment that the problem for this study was not clear. The revised manuscript has a problem state clarifying why health personnel were chosen as the subjects for this study.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>Line 71: Correction has been done.</p> <p>Line 82-83: Specific complications obtained were presented in the results.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>ideas.</p> <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>Line 71: I think this sentence is a result. So, don't specify the number of participants in this section.</p> <p>Lines 82-83: specify the symptoms and complications were those encountered in children so that the sentence is consistent with the manuscript title.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Line 92: The following sentence "<i>The majority of the participants were medical officers</i>" is beyond the title of the section (<i>Gender of the healthcare professionals</i>)</p> <p>Table 1: delete this table as you have already given all information as a text. This sounds redundant. Beware of redundancy!</p> <p>What was the mean age of participants?</p> <p>What was their seniority in their work? These both variables can sensibly influence the answers from personnel</p> <p>Figure 1: you have to properly caption the x- and y-axes of this figure in order it is self-explanatory</p> <p>Figure 1: Change the title of this figure. It is confusing as it gives the impression you reported these symptoms directly in children</p> <p>Tables 1 and 2: The sum of percentages does not give 100%. Please compute the percentages again</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Line 143: What was the level of e</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Line 181: delete the sentence</p> <p>Other remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specify the limitations of the study - Use the latest reference of the World malaria report from the WHO (WHO, 2018) - Add "Acknowledgment" an "Authors' contributions" sections 	<p>Results</p> <p>Line 92: Title of the section is changed to "socio-demographic characteristics of study participants" done to reflect the table 1.</p> <p>Figure 1: X and Y axis of the figure is properly captioned now in its self-explanatory form.</p> <p>Figure 1: The title of the figure has been changed.</p> <p>Tables 1 and 2:</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Line 143: Authors need clarity on that comment</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Line 181: Sentence is deleted.</p> <p>Other remarks</p> <p>Limitations of the study, acknowledgement and Author's contributions are now written in the revised manuscript.</p>
e	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 34: change "are" to "is"</p> <p>Line 39: change "4" to "5" as there is also <i>P. knowlesi</i></p> <p>Line 44: delete "complicated"</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 34: The change has been done.</p> <p>Line 44: complicated is deleted now.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Materials and Methods Line 70: change “will be” to “were”	Materials and Methods Line 70: “will be” has been change to “were”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	