



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_47591
Title of the Manuscript:	Health care seeking behavior among caregivers of sick children who had severe malarial anaemia
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>Lines 18-24: Use the latest WHO malaria report published in 2018. Change all these figures you presented</p> <p>Lines 30-33: Add references</p> <p>Lines 34-39: What is the utility of this paragraph? I don't understand what you have behind the mind by mentioning this information</p> <p>Lines 36-37: I don't understand this sentence</p> <p>Your introduction may be shorter. The risk in longer introduction is the related to the possibility to go beyond the scope of the study by mentioning usefulness information.</p> <p>Within the manuscripts you used the terms "Caretakers" and "Caregivers". So, it would be more suitable to just use one of both.</p> <p>The authors have to give the identification number of the ethical clearance for realizing this study</p> <p>Lines 127-129: Present and develop this part more properly. For instance, how data you collected were presented? What software did you use to analyse data?</p> <p>You have to specify that all caregivers were females.</p> <p>Give the mean age of children and caregivers</p> <p>Table 1: The presentation of this table is catastrophic and confusing. The title is incomplete. So change the way of presenting data in this table</p> <p>Table 3: The presentation is confusing. I think, there should be just one value of Probability instead of many values to each line.</p>	<p>Lines 18-24. The requested changes made using WH 2018 report</p> <p>Lines 30-33 References present</p> <p>Lines 34-39 This section has been deleted</p> <p>Lines 36-37 This section has been deleted</p> <p>This is noted</p> <p>This has been changed. The word Caregivers has been used throughout</p> <p>This has been added</p> <p>This has been done</p> <p>This was an error. Not all were females. This has been corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>This has been redone</p> <p>This has been redone</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Table 4: This table is not necessary as the information is simple and can be presented literally or graphically using pie chart. In addition, how did you say that caregivers effectively gave antimalarial drugs? In previous studies, it was shown that caregivers were reporting painkillers as paracetamol as being antimalarial drugs. There would be an obvious risk of response bias if you based only on the caregivers' talks.</p> <p>Lines 171-172: What statistical test did you use? You have to better present the part regarding "Statistical analysis"</p> <p>Lines 176-178: I think you have to test this assumption as you have all data to make a chi-square test in order to test the association between level of education and health care options.</p> <p>All caregivers were females. I think you should discuss about this finding</p> <p>Lines 184-185: As previously mentioned, I told you there are many reports on the misconceptions of caregivers about medicines. You can use these reports to support your talks</p> <p>Lines 191-199: this paragraph is not enough discussed and lacks bibliographic references</p> <p>Lines 202-204: Add bibliographic references</p> <p>Lines 222-230: How can you explain this delay in presentation at health facility? You have to first give explanation to your findings before starting comparison with other studies</p> <p>Lines 233-234: Rephrase. It is confusing</p> <p>The authors have to mention a section "Acknowledgments"</p> <p>The authors have to present references as per guidelines of the journal. Look at the reference N°18 for instance which is not present as the majority of references.</p>	<p>This has been redone</p> <p>This has been explained</p> <p>This has been indicated</p> <p>This has been done</p> <p>This was an error. All of them were not females</p> <p>This is noted and clarified</p> <p>.This has been redone</p> <p>Reference has been added.</p> <p>This has been done</p> <p>This section has been added.</p> <p>No. 18 is a book and not a journal thus the way the reference is.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 15: change "four" to "five"</p> <p>Line 178: change "nigeria" to "Nigeria"</p> <p>Line 239: change "RECOMMENDATIONSSSS" to "RECOMMENDATIONS"</p>	<p>Line 15. The change has been made</p> <p>Line 178 Correction made</p> <p>Line 239 correction made</p>
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues