



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_46857</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Hematological parameters associated with malaria and its controls</b>
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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> The title is not totally right as you did not address any control of malaria. None of your results were clearly related to malaria control. So, reformulate the title.</p> <p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduce the abstract as some elements are useless within this section!</li> <li>▪ Your keywords are not consistent with the title of manuscript</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Lines 31-33:</b> Rephrase <b>Lines 40-43:</b> delete! It is confusing as there is no clear link with the backward sentence You clearly stated the link between changes in blood parameters and malaria. In addition, you outlined the modulation of this link by confounders such as nutritional status. However, the problematic that encouraged you to carry out this study is not clear. Please, clearly specify it within this section of the manuscript.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Lines 63-37:</b> Delete! It is not necessary to list material as this material will appear within the text by describing and explaining your methodology. As PhD holder and fundamental scientist, this way of writing, frequent among medical doctors, is a bit burdensome for readers as me.</li> <li>▪ <b>Lines 81-83:</b> add the ID number of all ethical clearances you have obtained.</li> <li>▪ <b>Line 89:</b> Add reference</li> <li>▪ <b>Specify exclusion criteria</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Specify the method of collection of blood samples among patients</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Lines 124-125:</b> You have to give characteristics of the rapid diagnostic test (RDT) you used for screening patients. What malarial species are detected by this RDT? Is this RDT met the quality criteria (panel score detection) defined by WHO? How did you interpret the results (invalid, valid = positive/negative) of this RDT? How did you ascertain this RDT was performed of appropriately by user?</li> <li>▪ <b>Lines 126:</b> You have to specify what statistical tests were used and the threshold used for defining significance.</li> </ul>	



**Results**

- **You have outlined you used questionnaire to document sociodemographics of patients. So, present a table depicting them.**
- **Lines 133-135:** You have to establish clearly the way you analysed data. This sentence is surprising and constrains me to make more efforts of understanding. So, clearly and carefully present your data analysis strategy within the “Materials and Methods” section.
- Tables 1 and 2 is not your result. So move it to the section “Materials and Methods” section.
- **Figures 1 to 13:** You said you used RDT to detect malaria infection. So, nothing was done on the method you use to quantify parasitemia. Please, add section termed “Light microscopy” for instance and briefly describe the method and its interpretation.
- **Did you log-transform parasitemia values before correlation with blood parameters?**
- **Where are the p-values of correlational analysis between parasitemia with blood parameters?**
- **Lower the number of figures**
- **Your statistical analysis strategy is poor. Indeed, you underexploited the potential of your data as tests such as Pearson chi-square, t test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), regression could have brought more information.**
- **Use the component principal analysis (CPA) to analyse the relation between blood parameters and malaria status, parasitemia. This method will give us a better insight of your results and resulting findings**
- **What was the utility of control group as this group does not clearly appear in results?**

**Discussion**

- **Lines 182-189:** Is there any scale or cut-off to appreciate the practical significance of Likelihood values? If so, you have to specify it within the “Materials and Methods”
- **Lines 188-189:** Explain the logical link between anaemia and malaria as you have found “strong link” between them (with references).
- **Lines 198-258:** rephrase! All the sentences look like results; However you already are within the DISCUSSION section. Discussion means explain its findings using physiological, biochemical, psycholigcal kens and not merely put again results or just reformulate them. This part of the paper is poorly written. Discussion means not only



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>compare results with those of previous studies.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Rephrase</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Refresh your references. The most recent paper was published in 2008 (11 years ago). You have to have references not older than 5 years too.</li><li>▪ Standardize references as per guidelines of the journal. References N° 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 18 and 20 are not properly presented. There are lots stylistic problems namely:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Semicolons are placed after date of publication in one reference while full stops are placed in most of the references</li><li>- Pages of papers are not uniformly presented in all references</li><li>- Pages of papers are absent in certain references</li><li>- Sometimes you used "et al" after the third author and elsewhere it's after the sixth author</li><li>- You gave the complete noun of journal in certain references while you used abbreviations in other ones</li><li>- The abbreviation of journal of the twentieth reference is wrong.</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>NB:</b> as a rule of thumb, carefully check each reference and standardize with respect to guidelines of the journal.</p>	
--	--	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract</b> <b>Introduction</b> Line 28: change "porotozoan" to "protozoan" Line 33: change "<i>plasmodium</i>" to "<i>Plasmodium</i>" Line 29: change "anopheles" to "Anopheles" Lines 30-31: add <i>Plasmodium knowlesi</i> as malarial specie also responsible for malaria in humans Line 33: change "<i>Plasmodium falciparum</i> (<i>P. falciparum</i>)" to "<i>P. falciparum</i>" <b>Materials and Methods</b> <b>Discussion</b> <b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Beware to spelling you use for writing this paper. Indeed, you both US and UK spelling within your paper with terms such as "haematological" (abstract) and "hematological" (title and abstract). So, please carefully go through your manuscript and revise it! It's the same issue with other terms such as "anemia/anaemia"  Specify the limits of your study.</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> NO, but however the authors have to specify the ID number of all ethical clearances</p>	

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:	<b>Kamgain Mawabo Lugarde</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cameroon</b>