



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Parasitology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJP_49360 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Rapid Diagnostic Test and Microscopy in the Detection of Plasmodium falciparum malaria infection among Undergraduate Students in South-western 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was the RDT test correctly performed? Or maybe there were lower levels of parasitemia not detected by RDT. The majority of RDT tests show high level of Plasmodium detection at parasitemia of at least 2000 parasites/ul. In this case, the students show low parasite densities (+ and ++ parasite loads). (Tseroni, M; Pervanidou, D....and MALWEST Project. Field application of SD BIOLINE Malaria Ag Pf/Pan Rapid Diagnostic Test for malaria in Greece. 2015, PLoS ONE 10(3); e0120367,doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120367. 2. Results: please, do not repeat data on tables that have already been written on the text. i.e. Table 1, Table 2. 3. Why was it necessary to resort to the aid of an Atlas of Helminthology and Protozoology for making a microscopic diagnosis? 4. Discussion: please shorten the discussion, it is too long. Do not repeat data from section Results in the Discussion. 5. Line 206. Please do not begin the sentence with a number: 97 (56.4%) complained..... Write instead, ninety-seven | <p>The RDT test was performed correctly and the results interpreted according to manufacturer's instructions. Nevertheless, the authors agree with the reviewer's point of view that the low prevalence of <i>P. falciparum</i> malaria infection observed in this study could be due to low parasite densities (+ and +++ parasite loads) in the study participants. This point is well noted and has been accommodated in the discussion session.</p> <p>Point noted and taken care of.</p> <p>Not necessary. Statement deleted.</p> <p>Revised as required.</p> <p>Correction effected.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>-----</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The manuscript has epidemiological value. It may be published after making the necessary corrections mentioned above.</p> | <p>Many thanks to the reviewer.</p> |

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