



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_47535
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of haematological parameters in hookworm and Plasmodium falciparum co-infected individuals in Kintampo North Municipality, Ghana
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 11: You specified your interest in <i>P. falciparum</i>. However, it is necessary to talk about this species in the background of the abstract for better understanding by readers not familiar to this research field. - Lines 15-18: Delete this sentence. It is not necessary in the abstract - Lines 19-24: Rewrite this part as you have to present some figures as well as some basic information including the mean age of patients and the population size. - Your keywords must be revised as "Hematological parameters" should be appeared for instance - The different sections of the abstract as unbalanced. The conclusion and background should not have the same size as the results (6 lines each). So, shorten the conclusion and background <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try keeping constant in the writing. Indeed, sometimes your write "Hookworm" and elsewhere within the manuscript you also write 'Hook worm'. Please go through the manuscript and standardize it! - Lines 54-55: why did you specify you were going to focus on <i>N. americanus</i> you talked about <i>A. duodenale</i> also? <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which statistical test did you use to verify the homogeneity of variance before using ANOVA test? If not, you have to use non-parametric test as Kruskal-Wallis for testing means as you sample size is small - The authors have to perform a Principal component analysis (PCA) of blood parameters, parasite density of <i>P. falciparum</i> and <i>N. americanus</i> by also including qualitative variables such as gender, age group, type of infection (single or mixed). The generated PCA plot will give a better insight of the correlation between blood parameters and these both parasites. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present the sociodemographic characteristics of patients and control including the mean 	<p>Comment has been address and highlighted</p> <p>Line 15-18 has been deleted as suggested</p> <p>It has been addressed</p> <p>It has been addressed</p> <p>It has been addressed and highlighted</p> <p>Microscopy identify hookworm spp. But cant differentiate the two species, hence we did PCR, which showed all the cases to be <i>Necator americanus</i>.</p> <p>homogeneity of variance was checked before the analysis</p> <p>It has been addressed and highlighted</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>age.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many people were infected reported as single-infected with <i>P. falciparum</i> and co-infected? This is important as the choice of statistical tests is dependent. - Table 2: Mention the number of each category (healthy, Na, Na + Pf, and Pf) - Table 2: some letters are absent in some figures as those presenting the mean values of haemoglobin, platelets and RBCs - The authors must provide results about homogeneity of variance. Indeed, the authors must not use ANOVA unless there is no heterogeneity of variance. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Your discussion needs deep revision as you spent your time to discuss about the negative effect of <i>N. americanus</i> or <i>P. falciparum</i> single infections on blood parameters instead of discussing on differences between single infections and mixed infections. For proof, look at the lines 7-9 of the abstract. Your discussion is not in line with the objective presented in these lines. <p>“ Lines 7-9: <i>The main aim of the study was to compare the haematological parameters of these infections in a co-infection state with haematological parameters of these same infections occurring as single infections.</i>”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In addition, beware of too long discussion by adding elements/hypotheses you have not tested. Generally, you should explain your results with your data first. Then, you can propose hypotheses to your findings. However, avoid to develop ideas a lot from others authors; just make a summary and then put the corresponding reference. 	<p>It has been addressed and highlighted</p> <p>It has been addressed and highlighted This is because there was no statistical significant difference among the groups for those haematological parameters.</p> <p>Has been addressed</p> <p>The discussion has been thoroughly revised and changes highlighted.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>