



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_10598
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE PATTERN OF MALARIA PREVENTION AND CONTROL IN PREGNANCY BY HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF FOCUSED ANTENATAL CARE IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<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	This is a good paper, but needs English language editing. There were marked mixture of tenses, and so the entire manuscript requires English language editing. The word access should be changed to assess. Some questions that need answers. Does Enugu state have 3 or 4 senatorial seats? Do Nurses and pharmacists prescribe drugs in those centers? State clearly whether ACTS can be used in severe malaria in pregnancy. 35: Please correct the sentence.....with by plasmodium 50: What is the mg equivalent of four or three tablets? 56: correct the sentence.....pregnant women be given receives 138; please correct..... did not believed	Enugu State has three Senatorial Districts namely: Enugu-North, Enugu-West and Enugu-South. The study sample showed that majority of the health facilities sampled were either primary health care centres (9) or private hospitals(5). Most primary health care centres in Nigeria lack qualified medical doctors and are normally manned by a qualified nurse with other health-care professionals being the “Community Health Workers (CHEW)”. Thus, in such settings, these nurses and CHEWs take care of antenatal care/visits and actually can prescribe for common ailments like malaria. Besides, some of the hospitals described as ‘secondary hospitals’ were actually mission hospital were most times the nurses are in charge of antenatal visits and are allowed to write and administer prescriptions only for such drugs used as preventive therapy like the routine multiple vitamins and haematinics, tetanus toxoid injections and also SP for Intermittent Preventive Therapy (IPT).



SDI Review Form 1.6

		The study evaluated practices based on the National Guideline Recommendations, and ACTs are not the recommended for the management of severe malaria. Rather, quinine and artesunate or artemether injections are recommended. Other corrections have also been effected.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	A. Specific Comments: i. ABSTRACT: Study Design; Why not write –a prospective cross-sectional study? Results; Abbreviation must be defined before usage or if possible be avoided in the abstract. Eg MIP [page 1 line 23]. What is MIP? The results were incompletely written. Out of the 113 respondents, how many questionnaires were completely/correctly filled and analyzed? This must be mentioned. You appear to be putting percentage without the actual value. Why not state exactly the actual figure before percentage number (%)? Do the	The study design and abbreviation have been corrected. The actual number of administered questionnaire was 120 and 113 were correctly filled and thus analyzed. The actual figures have also been inserted before the percentages. The conclusion has also been rephrased. BODY OF MAUSCRIPT INTRODUCTION. The rationale of the study could be found in the last paragraph of the introduction section. A sentence on justification has also been added. METHODS A copy of the data collection instrument has been added. The questionnaire was face validated by professionals in the area of Clinical pharmacy and also using the National Guideline on Malaria Prevention and Control for its content validity. The knowledge categories was based on the premise that the Reference Manual for Healthcare Providers used a score of 70% and above as benchmark for assessment after the training. The manual has also been cited. The last sentence under “Sampling” and the first sentence under “Data Collection” adequately explained the inclusion criteria as ‘ those facilities with an ANC clinic and health professionals that were directly involved in the ANC clinics and who were also available on the day of visit to the facility. The sample size determination has been written. The statistical tool ie SPSS has been stated in the work. RESULTS All 113 questionnaires were correctly filled and were analysed as efforts were made by the field staff to go through all completed questionnaires
---------------------------------------	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	same under result section in the body of manuscript. Conclusion; This is quite different from the study findings. This must be re-done to reflect the actual findings. ii. BODY OF MANUSCRIPT INTRODUCTION: This is good, but could be better if revised. The authors need to revise the introduction by adding a robust paragraph stating the rationale and justification of their study METHODS: The word 'state' should be State. The data collection instrument was not seen for	before leaving the field so as to avoid incomplete data or errors. The exact figures have been added to the write-up. I don't think I have a flow chart for this study recruitment nor that one is needed as this is not a clinical trial that requires follow-up. It is a survey and thus can only have a response rate, but since the questionnaire administration was a one-point administration, it was either the respondents consented to fill the questionnaires or refused, in which case no questionnaire was administered to non-consenting professionals. In table 3 (Treatment Practices), the drugs used for management of severe malaria were omitted and has been included in the table as was reported in the text. DISCUSSION There are limited number of previous studies assessing knowledge or practice among health professionals in this area and the ones that were identified by the authors have already been referenced in the text (see references Nos 16. 17 and 30). The term 'irrational' used in the text was based on non-conformation of the some of the prescribing practices to both the WHO and the National Recommendations concerning MIP prevention and Control. CONCLUSION This has been duly revised. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT This has also been added.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	validity. How did you ensure the validity of the questionnaires used in this study? You need to cite the reference source of this information in the data analysis section -“Also the knowledge level was categorized as either ‘high knowledge’ or ‘low knowledge’ based on a cutoff point of greater than or equal to 70% score on the 10 knowledge questions”. How did you arrive at this information? There were a lot of omissions in the method section: The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study were NEVER stated. The statistical tool used for data analysis was NEVER stated.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The Sample size determination was NEVER stated. RESULTS: The entire result section needs to be revised. Out of the 113 respondents, how many questionnaires were completely/correctly filled and analyzed? This must be mentioned. As pointed out in the abstract as follows- You appear to be putting percentage without the actual value. Why not state exactly the actual figure before percentage number (%)? Do the same under result section in the body of manuscript. You need to attach the flow chart of all the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	participants so as to illustrate all the participants recruited and how they fared in the study. You never stated that you will do test of significance in the method section? WHY DID YOU suddenly start to list ($p < 0.05$)?[see the tables]. DISCUSSION: What is the relationship between study and previous study? Any gap in knowledge now filled by your study? The authors have continued to use the word ‘irrational’! How did you arrive at this word? Is there any scientific basis for the word in this study? You need to state this clearly, otherwise	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	remove the word from the entire manuscript. CONCLUSION: This appears quite different from the study findings. It needs revision. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This was not palpable in the manuscript. REFERENCES: Some of the references are Ok. OVERALL CONCLUSION OF THE REVIEWER; The manuscript is Acceptable with Major revision.	
<u>grOptional/General</u> comments		This was a very extensive review and the reviewer's efforts were highly appreciated. Thanks.