



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_47884
Title of the Manuscript:	Low Prevalence of Asymptomatic Malaria in Pregnancy among Subjects Attending Antenatal Clinic At A Tertiary Hospital in Bauchi, 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>)



[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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 10 – 12: Complete the sentence. • Lines 18 – 21: This does not belong to the abstract. Focus on presenting your results and not summary of the sociodemographic characteristics. • Lines 21 – 22: Show how the prevalence of malaria varies with these sociodemographic variables. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add references to the following sentences: lines 50 – 52, lines 55 – 56. • Lines 63 – 64: The sentence is not clear. Rephrase. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>This section is generally not well described.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe malaria transmission in the area. • How was the sample size of 140 determined? The sample size in this study is very small and explains why no meaningful association was observed between malaria prevalence and most of the sociodemographic variables. In most cases, malaria was observed only in participants that were on malaria prophylaxis, sleeping under ITNs and using insecticide spray (lines 112 – 120). All these are against the current knowledge of malaria and its control. The small sample size implies you do not have enough power to make a conclusion. • Describe the sampling technique used to recruit the participants. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria? • Owing to the limitations of RDTs as highlighted in lines 133 – 140, why was microscopy not used to complement or at least confirm the results of RDT? <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 112 – 120: Start by presenting the overall prevalence of malaria along with its 95% confidence limit. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 141 – 142: Sentence is not clear. Rephrase. • Add a reference to lines 142 – 144. • Lines 177 – 185: More effort should have been made to increase the sample size in order to obtain sufficient power to make a conclusion. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 14: What is ATBUTH? Define all abbreviations at first use. Same to Line 59, 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>what is HRPS and pLDH?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line 157: What do you mean by non-informal? 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author(s) assessed the prevalence of asymptomatic malaria and associated factors among pregnant women attending the antenatal clinic at the Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University Teaching Hospital in Bauchi, Nigeria. The major strength of the study is the target population of pregnant women who are most at risk of the effect of malaria. The major weakness is the small sample size of the participants which make me wonder if the author(s) actually computed the sample size a priori. A study with a low outcome like this is expected to have a large sample size, not 140 as in this study. Because of this, I conclude that the study does not have sufficient power to make any meaningful conclusion and cannot be considered for publication at the moment. My comments to improve the quality of the study are above.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p><i>Tebit Kwenti Emmanuel</i></p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p><i>University of Buea, Cameroon</i></p>