

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_84160
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Malaria among Pregnant Women in Braithwaite Memorial Specialist Hospital, Port Harcourt and General Hospital, Bori by Haemoglobin Level
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.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Why line number is not included in the manuscript? Line number is important guide on which line needed to be revised or inquired throughout reviewing and editing process.</p> <p>ABSTRACT SECTION</p> <p>1. Please correct the grammatical error in line "... permission from the selected health facilities ..."</p> <p>2. The spelling for p-value must be standardized, whether it is capital or small case, through the manuscript</p> <p>3. Spelling errors for "Haemoglobin" and "Aniaemia"</p> <p>4. Please elaborate this line "Early detection is key".</p> <p>5. Why the prevalence of BM</p> <p>6. Is it BMH or BMSH?</p> <p>INTRODUCTION SECTION</p> <p>Paragraph 1:</p> <p>1. Second sentence is redundant. First sentence has already mentioned that malaria is serious</p> <p>Paragraph 4:</p> <p>1. Please cite "Recent world malaria report indicates that Nigeria accounts for quarter of all malaria cases in the 45 malaria endemic countries in Africa thus showing the challenge malaria poses in Nigeria."</p> <p>Paragraph 5:</p> <p>1. If "red cells" refer to red blood cells, please spell it out in full.</p> <p>MATERIALS and METHODS SECTION</p> <p>Study Population</p> <p>1. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria?</p> <p>2. Please provide the questionnaire as a supplementary for transparency.</p> <p>Sampling technique</p> <p>1. Please elaborate the calculation of sampling size. Please include alpha value, power, and final estimated sample size. You may include the formula. Do not cite Aroaye (2014) without its information in the reference. This is too not reliable.</p> <p>Statistical analysis</p> <p>1. Please mention the type of statistical test that you use. Mean comparison is just a category of a lot of tests, please be more specific.</p> <p>2. What deduction is made at 0.05 level of significance? Please explain.</p> <p>RESULTS SECTION</p> <p>1. Why all Figure and Tables are not mentioned in the text? No elaboration and interpretation are provided for each figure or table. Do not expect the reader to interpret for</p>	

	<p>you. This is not acceptable in any scientific manuscript or article.</p> <p>2. What does it mean with equal distribution?</p> <p>3. The author mentioned that there 400 pregnant subjects, please explain why there are only N = 396 in Figure 1, N = 89 in Figure 2. I thought all the subjects are pregnant (as mentioned in the title).</p> <p>4. Figure 3 is wrong. Why are there repetition of BSC and Ssce/SSCE? Please provide full name of these abbreviations at the footnote of the figure. If possible, please use fewer education level classification (eg. primary education, secondary education, etc.)</p> <p>5. Figure 4, what are M and S? Please provide a footnote to clarify the abbreviation in all FIGURES and TABLES.</p> <p>6. For caption on Table 1, if the word “prevalence” is used, please specify it as the prevalence of malaria among pregnant women. If mentioned that it is the prevalence of malaria infection without specifying who is your sampled population may be misleading to the reader.</p> <p>DISCUSSION SECTION</p> <p>Paragraph 1</p> <p>1. Similar to the comment in Results, what do you mean with “prevalence of malara” is it including the children and non-pregnant subjects admitted to GHB?</p> <p>Paragraph 2</p> <p>1. What statistical test did the author use for this. This is result and should be in Result Section not Discussion.</p> <p>2. “The women from Braithwaite Memorial Specialist Hospital, Port Harcourt are mostly educated”. The author should at least report the comparison on this in the Results section.</p> <p>3. “Therefore the” is a hanging sentence.</p> <p>CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION SECTION</p> <p>1. “ malaria was more prevalent in Bori than in BMSH” is not factually correct. The author may have studied the prevalence of malaria among pregnant women BUT NOT overall malaria cases happened in general population. Hence, mentioning that “malaria is more prevalent” is misleading and the author should specify that “malaria among pregnant women”.</p> <p>2. Comparing Bori and BMSH is not consistent. Bori is a region/district whereas BMSH is a hospital. The author should by all means be consistent that he/she is actually comparing the cases between 2 hospitals in precise (in this case, GHB and BMSH).</p> <p>References</p> <p>1. There are many in-text citations missing in the references. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- WHO (2020)- (Guerin et al., 2002)-(Imeausen et al., 2005)-(Menendez et al., 2007-(Rogerson <i>et al.</i>, 2007)- (Miller <i>et al.</i>, 1997)-(Chen <i>et al.</i>, 2000)-(Janice, 2003)-(Omosun <i>et al.</i>, 2009)- Maltech et al. (1994)	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.6

	- White (1998) - Amadi et al. (2002)	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The data in the results, which should be the very important essence in this study, are presented wrongly. No description of most figures and graphs in the text. No mention of proper statistical test, thus the statistical test the author did would not have value. Not many citations is included to support the finding. My comments have mentioned it all.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wei Kit Phang
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaya, Malaysia