

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_86641
Title of the Manuscript:	Malaria Prevalence and Anemia Status of Children Attending a Health Facility in Yola
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy> )

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Interpret the ORs calculated in the results section. Provide a section on recommendations in the abstract Provide sections on recommendations and limitations after the discussion Explain how the sample size of 200 was obtained and how the children were randomly selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The interpretation of OR was provided in the manuscript. OR means Odds Ration</li><li>• According to the journal guidelines there is no recommendations in the abstract.</li><li>• Recommendation is optional as per journal guidelines. However, since it is optional, we have added sections on recommendation in the manuscript. The limitations was already mention in the manuscripts in section 2.2</li><li>• The samples size was chosen based on the number of patients visiting the health facility, and systematic random sampling was adopted during sampling</li></ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	You stated this in the abstract “the results also show that malaria parasite density has an effect on the PCV levels of the children as patients with severe anaemia had the highest parasite loads”. What was the significance level?  State clearly whether ethical clearance was obtained or not  You stated that this study is a pilot study. Why is it a pilot study? I will recommend you delete that information from your text	The significant level is .0001. It was corrected in the manuscript.     The ethical clearance was obtained prior to the commencement of the work. It is stated in the manuscript as 2.7.  The information was deleted
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It will have been better to separate the results from the discussion	As per the journal guidelines, results can be join together with the discussion.

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)	