



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_8920
Title of the Manuscript:	UNDERSTANDING OF MALARIA AND ITS THERAPEUTIC REGIMENS – THE WAY FORWARD
Type of the Article	Review 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	I must commend you for a good review but I suggest you consider the following: - I am not against referencing textbooks but it seems most of your review were based on textbooks and reports. - It is expected that a sound review should consider publications in peer reviewed journals. Essentially, you systematically review the chain of events to date; making references to published works in peer reviewed journals. - Also, your review should prompt questions and suggestions for further research. This was grossly lacking in most of the subheadings. - An expert in a particular field will expect to see certain publications that are fundamentals to the progress of research. This is also, not the case in this review. - While I do agree with the references to publications from Nigeria but the references relating to certain subheadings like malaria pathogenesis, development of vaccines, malaria resistance etc should cite references from well established journals like Malaria Journals (although you cited 3 or 4 articles from this journal), PLoS etc - Based on the above, the review does not actually reflect the title - UNDERSTANDING OF MALARIA AND ITS THERAPEUTIC REGIMENS – THE WAY	The journal references constitute over 50%. But I have added more than 40 references from other journals. I have improved upon the article by making references to other peer reviewed journals. Upward review of the current state of malaria has been considered. Questions and suggestions have been prompted in the present revised manuscript. I tend to disagree with this. But other publications that are fundamental to the progress of research have been added. Thank you for this suggestion. I have taken care of that. Having taken care of all the above, I am optimistic that the review should actually reflect the title: UNDERSTANDING OF



SDI Review Form 1.6

	FORWARD	MALARIA AND ITS THERAPEUTIC REGIMENS – THE WAY FORWARD. But alternatively the title can be changed to: UNDERSTANDING OF MALARIA AND ITS THERAPEUTIC REGIMENS – PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Although the review was properly structured and presented, I suggest you consider minor errors associated with punctuation marks and make corrections where necessary, like in Line 491 – plasmodium falciparuminvitro.	Thanks for your comments! I have considered your valuable suggestions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		