



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18935
Title of the Manuscript:	Co-infection of malaria and typhoid fever in feverish patients in the Kumba Health District, Southwest Cameroon: public health implications
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	--Line 151. Malaria parasite was detected in 186 participants but table 1 indicated that the number positive for MP was a total of 158 being 146+12. Kindly reconcile this difference.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Line 4; Aetiologic instead of Aetologic MATERIALS AND METHODS -Line 73-75; Blood meant for the smear of Giemsa staining should have been put separately in EDTA anticoagulant bottles to avoid clotting before making smears. -Why was stool culture alone used for isolation of the typhoid bacilli instead of stool and blood or blood alone? -Line113; What is the usefulness of including oxidase enzyme test instead of urease enzyme test? RESULTS -Line 143 should read 206 patients not 206 febrile patients, hence febrile condition was only confirmed in 27 patients (see line 146/147). -The title of the second column of table 1 should be 'No. of Febrile Patients N=178 (see line 186).	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Line 186. 178 patients not 178 febrile patients. -Line 289. Of the aged not of the old -Line 290. Of the aged not of the old -Line 294-297 is a repetition/replica of line 301-304. Line 294-297 should be deleted. REFERENCES - line 331. (Ref no. 7) is incomplete. Include the website -Line373. (Ref. no. 26). Date (yr 1999) is wrongly positioned. - ethical issues- Yes there was ethical approval. The ethical clearance for this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the South West Regional Delegation of Public Health, Cameroon while an administrative clearance was obtained from the Director of the Kumba District Hospital.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria