



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_47342
Title of the Manuscript:	MALARIA VECTOR ABUNDANCE AND THE INCIDENCE OF MALARIA PARASITEMIA AMONGST STUDENTS LIVING IN NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY HOSTELS
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The abstract must be shortened as there are a few repetitive ideas in some parts especially the Methodology part. 2) Some phrases should be rephrased 3) The conclusion is not consistent with the topic as you did not study the association between bed net usage and malaria infection; Knowledge-Attitudes-Practices (KAP) and malaria infection 4) Your keywords are not consistent with the manuscript title. I propose you the following: Malaria, Incidence, Students, Vector abundance 5) Just present main and significant results which are consistent with the study objectives <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lines 38-40: You have to develop the idea. If not, it is very difficult to understand what you have on your mind 2) Line 47: What the term "tertiary institutions" means? I am confused about it 3) Lines 48-52: Add bibliographic references <p>Material and Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Lines 70-73: These phrases are not in line with the heading. Place them elsewhere and in appropriate way within the manuscript 2) Lines 78-82: Add the ID number of your ethical clearance 3) Standardize the headings of this section. Sometimes you write all the heading in small letters while other are in capital letters 4) Why did you use the Plus sign system for determination of parasitemia instead of direct determination? 5) Line 116: Did you use the dipping method for collecting larval? 6) Line 118: What keys did you use to identify the different species of mosquitoes? 7) Lines 131-134: These sentences are not consistent with the heading 8) Line 146: what software (and version) did you use to perform statistical analysis? What Chi-square test did you use to compare proportions? 9) Much information given in this section are redundant 10) Please carefully present the different activities of the study in a logical order for easier understanding by readers <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) You have to present findings on socio-demographic data of participants (gender, mean age, age groups, ect.) 2) Lines 152-156: Rephrase and reduce the length of the sentence 3) Lines 161-163: Rephrase and reduce the length of the sentence 4) Figure 2: This figure does not present the values of prevalence. You just presented numbers 5) Lines 167-169: Rephrase, it's confusing 	



- 6) **Lines 170-173:** Make two sentences and rephrase
- 7) How many breeding sites did you find?
- 8) **Table 3:** this table must be better presented
- 9) **Lines 179-182:** Rephrase, it's confusing
- 10) **Lines 182-183:** Rephrase, it's confusing
- 11) Why the figure presented in sentence N°184 are different from those presented in Table 4?
- 12) **Lines 196-198:** Rephrase, the style is not good. This makes more difficult the understanding of the sentence

Discussion

- 1) Give an explanation of why the prevalence of malaria infection is so high among students. Your explanation you gave in lines 211-214 is not sufficient as you have to compare the prevalence of malaria with regard to LLINs usage using chi-square or logistic regression model in order to support your explanation.
- 2) **Lines 208-210:** Delete this sentence. It is not helpful
- 3) **Lines 217-225:** Delete this paragraph! It is useless to discuss statistically non-significant results
- 4) **Lines 226-226:** Rephrase! I don't understand what you want to mean
- 5) **Lines 235-236:** You had not determine the relation between malaria prevalence, use of LLINs and locations (A, B, C, D and E)
- 6) **Lines 238-242:** You used the term "correlation" in this paragraph. However, you did not compute any correlation coefficient. So, rephrase
- 7) **Lines 262-263:** You said "*Surprisingly, Anopheles mosquito larvae were collected in the habitat with gasoline at location D, as it have also been reported in the study of (24).*" So, what can explain this finding?

Conclusion

This conclusion must be rephrased and more consistent with the objectives

References

The authors have to present bibliographic references as per guidelines of the journal (IJTDH). For instance, sometimes you give the full name of the journal in the reference while in others you give abbreviation of the journal (References N° 18, 22, 23). So, go through all the references and standardized them properly.

Other:

- 1) Some sections are absent: Acknowledgment, funding, authors' contribution, conflict of interest



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>1) Line 9: Change “between March through September” to “from March to September”</p> <p>2) Line 30: Change “Keyword” to “Keywords”</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1) Line 42: change “anti malarial” to “antimalarial”</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors should rephrase many sentences of the manuscript in a more meaningful style. Lots of sentence are very confusing.</p> <p>The quality of Tables and figures should be improved in order to meet the standard criteria of quality.</p> <p>The authors can improve the quality of results by using more appropriate analysis tools such as logistic regression, correlation analysis.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamgain Mawabo Lugarde
Department, University & Country	Canada