

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_84100
Title of the Manuscript:	Age-Dependent Prevalence of Malaria Parasitemia among Pregnant Women in Selected Tertiary Hospitals in Rivers State.
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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1.2. There is a need to revise the heading to answer the following observations: Why do you want to know the age-dependent prevalence of malaria....? The topic should highlight why a research is carried out. You may wish to revise3. What is the benefit/significance/use of the relationship between age and prevalence of malaria parasitaemia with pregnant women/pregnancy? Why do you want to bring the relationship to light? This should be the main aim of the research4. Re-organize the introduction of the research. You may wish to: Broadly write about malaria, what has been/is being done about it, malaria in pregnancy, why it is a problem...then age relationship and why you are working on that. To what end is the study aiming?5. Reconsider the study design: Was it longitudinal? For how long have the study subjects been followed and how many times were they observed/studied/assessed?6. State hypotheses: To use chi-square test you need hypotheses (Null hypothesis and alternate hypothesis). What are they?7. You may need to have a research question. Was there a research question that can be answered by the study findings?8. Results should tell us the findings and not just a table. This finding is about parasitaemia. Result should be about all findings from the study including the questionnaire findings.9. Discussion should be about bringing to light the answer to your research question and how it relates to other studies in same field or similar situations to the study you conducted. It should help in drawing a conclusion that can be referenced and adds to information in the field of study.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Title and aim reconstructed2. They have been addressed by reconstructing the aim.3. Comment noted. Study aim re-constructed4. The study design is a cross-sectional study. Correction effected5-6. The focus of the study at the tail end of the introduction section provides the research interest and gap authors seek to answer.7. Result tables are not left alone without comments8. Discussion edited to reflect the review comment
Minor REVISION comments	A conclusion should be more than just a sentence.	Noted
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	