



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1762 http://www.sciencedomain.org/uploads/1333284911-BJAST.docx
Title of the Manuscript:	Association Between Sickle Cell Trait and Low Density Parasitaemia Among Asymptomatic and Parasitaemic individuals Living in <i>P. falciparum</i> Malaria Holoendemic Region of Western Kenya.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The author conducted a study describing the occurrence of malaria parasitaemia in asymptomatic patients with HBAS HBAA. He later compares the levels of parasitaemia between the two groups. He also compares the levels of haemoglobin between the two study groups. This study also describes the proportion of people with HBAS in the region The study is fairly well written and easy to understand. However the science being described has already been documented in other studies.	No action required
Specific comments:	None	



SDI Review Form 1.5

Title and abstract	The Title is quite long, it is 23 words. It would be better if it is made shorter	Done/corrected
Introduction (<i>Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?</i>)	Yes	No action required
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Yes	No action required
Materials & methods (<i>Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work</i>)	Yes	No action required
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures.)	Results presentation ; Study profile would be represent the screening/ Recruitment process Table 3, He included the two participants with HB ss, and yet in the abstract it is mentioned the analysis was done only for HBss and HB AS	342 volunteers were enrolled for the study. We wanted to compare HbAS and HbAA but when we did Hb electrophoresis we found two with HbSS. These were excluded in the analysis of parasitaemia but included in the overall prevalence of HbAS vs



SDI Review Form 1.5

Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	The discussion needs some improvement ; The following are my suggestions ; He needs to put his references at the end of the sentence Page 9 line 238 : Omit the independent sample T test Page 9 line 238 – 239 : the sentence could be improved as follows: These results are similar to a study conducted in Benin where they found.....	HbAA. The rest of the corrections have been done and highlighted.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	No action required
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	The conclusion is so long, it has 10 sentences. There are explanations in the conclusion, which ought to be in his discussion. He seems to be answering many questions in the conclusion. I suggest omit explanations in the conclusions. Dwell on	Done/corrected



SDI Review Form 1.5

	the conclusion that answers your objective question. It is better to stick to occurrence of parasitaemia and haemoglobin level in the two study groups. Conclusion sentence 271 – 273 should be used for recommendations	
References	Reference 2, correct spelling of Malaria	