



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>)

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>The technical quality and language of the manuscript need substantial improvement. The repetitions, between the section Introduction and Discussions should be avoided. Results that are presented in tables and figures need not be described again under the results and discussion sections until and unless the data need to be emphasised to draw some significant conclusion/novelty. There are enough scope to reduce the length of the manuscript by abbreviating some key repeated terminology, such as, P. falciparum instead of its full form and so on.</p> <p>Since the major focus of the work is to compare the performance of the HRP-II based RDT and microscopy, and the generated data implied far low performance of the RDT, the authors should suggest the potential modification/improvement of the RDTs based on the current literatures, e.g. few picks (1) Analytical Chemistry DOI: 10.1021/acs.analchem.9b00670 (2019). (2) ACS Combinatorial Science, 20 (6), 350–357 (2018). (3) Biosensors and Bioelectronics, 123, 30-35 (2019) etc.</p> <p>For the discretion of the authors: the target subject may be better projected as “young adult” instead of “undergraduate students” as due to obvious relation of the disease with the different age groups rather than the designations of the subjects.</p>	<p>Revised as suggested.</p> <p>Authors agree with the reviewer on this very important point and potential modification/improvement of the RDTs based on the current literatures have been suggested.</p> <p>Title has been modified as suggested</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Authors have addressed the issue as mentioned in the manuscript	