



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	<p>It is a very interesting work because it throws as information, for this particular case, the difference between the two techniques, which is always a point of discussion in order to find a quick method to diagnose in the field, although the gold standard method is the microscopy.</p> <p>In the results, It is convenient that the written part be shortened, since it is a mere repetition of what appears in the tables.</p> <p>It is recommended to merge tables 5 and 3.</p> <p>As it will be a paper, in the discussion it can be shortened more, avoiding being repetitive with the results</p>	<p>Revised as recommended.</p> <p>The authors see no reason to emerge tables 3 and 5. The former shows the frequency of occurrence of <i>Plasmodium falciparum malaria</i> infection among the study participants using microscopic method, while the later shows the severity of <i>plasmodium falciparum malaria</i> infection among those who tested positive by the same method.</p> <p>Revised as required.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>After a dot, numbers must be written</p> <p>Error: and microscopic methods. 5 ml of venous blood (See in the abstract)</p> <p>Correct: and microscopic methods. Five ml of venous blood</p>	<p>Correction made as required.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	