



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_18776
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Determinants of Artemisinin Resistance in K13 Gene of Plasmodium falciparum
Type of the Article	Minireview 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

	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	Paragraph 10: <i>In vitro</i> insusceptibility, It should be susceptibility. Paragraph 27: In vivo should be <i>in vivo</i>. Paragraph 123: why is <i>P.falciparum</i> in bold. <i>PfKelch 13</i> is the name of the gene so it should be in italics throughout the body of the text. Paragraph 149-153 needs to be reviewed: It does not make sense. Please check the article Mbengue <i>et al</i>, 2015 published in nature. Paragraph 234-235: Those mutations in Africa were not associated with ART resistance. You need to check whether this is true???Add a reference too? There have been reports of new K13 propeller gene in <i>P.falciparum</i> populations in Kenya. I think should mention this in section 167-Efficacy of ART in Africa... Table 2 needs to be rearranged. It is very confusing. The text is broken into unstructured paragraphs that makes it hard for the reader to read. Please modify this table.	Agreed and amended. Agreed and amended. Agreed and amended. Agreed and amended. Agreed, checked and amended. First changes were highlighted with yellow. Second changes were highlighted with red. Agreed, checked and this is true. References 2 and 33 added. It is under section 3.1. and 3. "Molecular markers as epidemiologically applicable haplotypes." Agreed, mentioned in Efficacy of ART in Africa and highlighted with yellow. Agreed and amended according to the opinion of the reviewer. Table is modified.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Your reference list needs to be corrected. The volume of each article is usually written in Bold and you have to write out the names of all the authors. Don't just write Smith A, Andrea B et al., DO NOT IGNORE the names of the rest of the authors. Paragraph 227: Fidock et al., you need to add the year. Paragraph 261: Please check the spelling Atovacone or Atovaquone...	The volume of the each article is not written in Bold in the archives of the BMRJ journal. Author guidelines in BMRJ journal mentioned that six authors with et al for the rest of the authors. Therefore I do not make changes to the references except the number of authors to fill up to six authors in two references 21& 25, error I made in the reference no.1 and one co-author name. These are highlighted in yellow. I deleted that part because the reviewer did not want much information on CQ resistance in his general comments. Agreed, checked and amended.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I find that you written a lot of information about CQ resistance which we already know. There is no need for so much info on CQ resistance. Maybe you can re-write this section of your paper and make it relevant to your article.	I have reduced the information about CQ resistance and rewrite to make it relevant to the article.