



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>)



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There are several sentences which have to be b) There are many repetitive sentences in the abstract making it uselessly too long. c) Just give the major findings of the study d) Find more appropriate keywords. Please just look at your title e) The conclusion of this abstract is not coherent with the manuscript title <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This introduction lacks of bibliographic references b) The lines 38-40 are not clear to me. Please rephrase c) What is the meaning of the following terms? "tertiary institutions" <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) This section is not well-written and confusing as you did not present the different activities in a clear order b) The headings of some section are lacking. c) I think it was more useful to give true value of parasite density instead of using "Plus system" d) Specify the name of software you used for statistical analyses as well as used tests e) Ideas developed in some headings are beyond this heading. For instance lines 131 to 134 f) This part is redundant as the abstract. So, shorter this part <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) You have to completely rephrase this section. In addition, make short sentences with one idea only for better understanding from reader b) Why socio-demographic data of participants were not presented c) The Figure 2 is not clear as the title talks about prevalence but you present numbers in this figure <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>This section is not well-written as it not in line with your results. You give explanation for results you did not address</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Rewrite the conclusion by giving clearer sentences and conclusions consistent with your objectives</p> <p>REFERENCES</p> <p>Some references are not presented as given in author's guide of the journal. For instance, references 18 and 22</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is not well-written as there are many confusing sentences. The way of presenting results in tables and figure can be improved and your discussion explanations are beyond your results. That's why the discussion is not in line with your results.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Loick Pradel Kojom
Department, University & Country	The University of Douala, Cameroon