SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_IJTDH_15093**
Title of the Manuscript:	**TRENDS IN MALARIA INCIDENCE RATES (2006-2013) IN EDO STATE, NIGERIA**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract**: Line 5 Line 6: The manuscript is void of detailed information on the severity of malaria. Line 14: The use of estimated malaria incidence rates seem not to indicate the actual rates; and so may be misleading. **Introduction**: Line 29 1. Poorly written introduction. The author(s) merely lifted-up words from published works without proper introduction into the topic. 2. No information on the aetiology of malaria in Edo State. 3. No information on endemicity or severity of malaria in Edo State based on published works. **Methods**: Line 76 Line 79-81 – Were these patients' treatment based on laboratory test results or presumptive diagnosis? Author(s) should refer to recent Nigerian publications on such issues; e.g., Peletiri (2013), Surmounting the Seven Major Obstacles against Eradication of Malaria in Nigeria: A Review. IJMRR, 1(4):40-46. **Results**: Line 85 1. This section should be cited with the results obtained with some appropriate explanations. 2. Discussed results under this section as shown from line 90 – 102 should rather be transferred to the appropriate discussion section. 3. Line 94 – 99; how was the proportion of severe (in-patient) cases categorized?	

	Table 3: Line 132 The severity column – M_1, M_2 & M_3 is not clear. Does your categorization into M_1, M_2 & M_3 mean severity? **Discussion:** Line 139 Discussion should be based on actual results (figures) obtained. Line 154 – 156; your assertion on the queried increasing malaria incidence rates as due to apparent non effectivity of strategies and policies in the State seems bias; and so, concrete proofs or evidence is required for your assertion to hold water. **Conclusion**: Line 162 Author(s) failed to recommend more effective control strategies after indicating that current strategies have failed. **References**: Line 169 Author(s) failed to refer to any indigenous published work on related topic(s) from Edo State. This should be addressed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript (including the abstract) should be upgraded in its presentation.	

Reviewer Details:

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