



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_47535
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of haematological parameters in hookworm and Plasmodium falciparum co-infected individuals in Kintampo North Municipality, Ghana
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Ms IJTDH_47535, entitled "Comparative analysis of haematological parameters in hookworm and Plasmodium falciparum co-infected individuals in Kintampo North Municipality, Ghana" presents several critical points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - microscopy and PCR experiments are declared in the text, but no results, graphs or images, are shown to test their execution. - The semiquantitative pcr method is exceeded, at least the pcr-real time is recommended. - The primers declared in the experimentation are to be collected in the complete table of: annealing temperature, base pairs of the amplified and how they have been designed. - the indications of housekeeping are missing - Tab.3 values of r for Pf and Hb are inverted with respect to the description in the text. - The relationship of P. falciparum intensity with related eosinophil count and monocytes showed medium, positive ($r = 0.281$, $p = 0.036$; $r = 0.154$, $p < 0.001$) and a statistically significant correlation, are reversed in the table. - the discussion is long and speculative - the bibliography shown is obsolete - the text is to be checked for typing errors 	
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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Franco Cervellati
Department, University & Country	University of Ferrara, Italy