

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_111440
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF ASYMPTOMATIC FALCIPARUM MALARIA, RISK FACTORS, AND ABSENCE OF PfHRP2 GENE DELETION IN MAKURDI, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Article

Review Form 1.7

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. The study provides valuable insights into asymptomatic falciparum malaria in Nigeria, the strength of some of its arguments could be enhanced by addressing the noted limitations. Expanding the sample size, including control groups, delving deeper into variables, and adhering to ethical considerations would all serve to strengthen the overall conclusions of the research.</p> <p>2. The title is correct but it is recommend that authors indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract</p> <p>3. It is recommend that the authors separate the abstract in the classic structure: background, method, results and discussion/conclusion.</p> <p>4. The structure is correct and is based on the scientific method</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. It is recommended that, given that this is an original study, it can be further explored in the different sections, providing more specific details.</p> <p>6.The references are corrected named but the number is very limited and It is especially striking that no mention is made in the discussion section. It is strongly recommended that a complete restructuring of the discussion be carried out.</p> <p>Areas for improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The study's findings regarding the lack of significant association between age or insecticide usage and malaria prevalence lack depth. Both age and insecticide effectiveness are complex variables that could be linked to malaria prevalence in varied and non-linear ways. For example, immunity can develop with age, affecting prevalence. Similarly, the impact of insecticides can be more nuanced, with factors like resistance patterns playing a role.- The research would benefit from a more holistic approach that also takes into account socioeconomic factors since lower socioeconomic status can correlate with increased exposure and limited access to preventive measures and treatment.- The implications of a history of treatment in affecting malaria prevalence are accurately drawn from the study's data. However, without knowing the reasons behind the higher prevalence among those recently treated, the argument cannot fully account for other	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>potential factors such as treatment failure, reinfection rates, or drug resistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The argument on insecticide usage being less significant in malaria prevention is weakened without detailed analysis. The type, frequency, and correct application of insecticides significantly affect their efficacy. The study should evaluate these factors to prevent misleading assessments of the impact of insecticides on malaria prevalence. For instance, resistance to certain insecticides could be an important factor in their effectiveness, which was not accounted for in the provided summary.- The absence of a control group raises issues about the ability to attribute findings directly to the variables studied. The argument of specific factors being significantly associated with malaria prevalence would be more robust if compared with a control group or another population with different environmental conditions. This would provide context and allow for the evaluation of whether these factors are unique or stronger in Makurdi relative to others.- The argument regarding bed net usage could be strengthened through a comprehensive exploration of bed net factors. Studies have shown that bed net effectiveness can vary significantly based on the type of netting material, level of insecticide impregnation, and user compliance. Including these variables in the analysis would provide a more nuanced understanding of bed net effectiveness and could help target future interventions.- The sample size of 374 is relatively small considering the population size of Makurdi and Nigeria as a whole. Expanding the sample size would enhance the generalizability of the results and might reveal additional risk factors or associations due to increased statistical power. However, it is also important to note that logistical and financial constraints often limit the scale of studies like these.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language is correct in grammar and vocabulary.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Víctor Quesada Cubo
Department, University & Country	Spain