



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_49529
Title of the Manuscript:	Subclinical Malaria and Reticulocyte Count in Apparently Healthy Female Undergraduate Students in Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
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	The general language/grammar in many parts of this manuscript is not clear. Makes sentences difficult to understand. There are several sentences in the manuscript that lacks clarity. Example, is "A total of 32 students (32 %) were infected with <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i> and a total of 68 uninfected students (68 %) were used as control in the study", from the abstract.	We did not infect the subjects rather the subjects were diagnosed to have had malaria infection with the parasite [Plasmodium falciparum] seen in their blood films. The sentence in question has been re-written and corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	Several minor revisions in expression of thought and content	The corrections and suggestions have been looked into and we have effected the changes.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript requires to be re-written. The major argument (in the result section) and conclusions made is not that definitive.	We have effected the points noted and have re-written those sections and we have tried to stay within the scope of this research. The typographic error in the result section on reticulocyte count in subjects without malaria parasite have been corrected from 0.13 ± 0.08 to 0.31 ± 0.08 to agree with our findings. Thank you so much for your contributions to making our research article better.

Comment [CY1]: Did you infect the 32 student with malaria?? Or what??

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)	