Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Volume 17 · Issue 9 · e150059

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Malaria Epidemiology in Rask City and Surrounding Areas (2020 - 2023), Southeast Iran

Mahdi Rezaei Kahkha-Zhaleh, Davoud Salahi, Shaghayegh Dabirzadeh, Mansour Dabirzadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Jun 2024	2 Oct 2024	6 Oct 2024	10.5812/jjm-150059

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission Mahmoud Rahdar, Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 14 Jul 2024 – 2 Aug 2024

Mahmoud Rahdar Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 14 Jul 2024

1. The manuscript requires grammatical editing. The writing does not exhibit an eloquent style.

2. The manuscript is excessively lengthy and should be concisely condensed.

3. The number of samples included in the study is unclear.

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 2 Aug 2024

The current manuscript describes the epidemiology of malaria in Rask City and its surrounding areas in Southeast Iran. While the epidemiological features of malaria in different areas of Iran are important, the manuscript suffers from numerous typographical and syntactic errors, making some sections, particularly the results, difficult to understand. Below are specific concerns and recommendations for improvement.
o The title mentions the study period as 2020-2023, while the methods section and introduction refer to 2018-2023. Ensure consistency in the study period throughout the manuscript. If the study period is indeed 2018-2023, update the title accordingly.
o The title should include the name of the province.
o The Abstract lacks clarity on how malaria was diagnosed, the total number of cases, and the breakdown of cases by Plasmodium species and gender.
o The introduction should present the malaria situation and relevant statistics in Iran and the study area.
o The first sentence of the introduction needs a reference.
o The study period mentioned at the end of the introduction is 2018-2023, which is six years, not five.
o The second paragraph of the data collection section belongs in the discussion, not the methods.
o The methods section should reflect that this is a retrospective study using data from health centers in Rask City.
o It is unclear how many health centers were involved and whether they included rural health centers.
o The manuscript mentions using Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests to compare seroprevalence, but there are no data on seroprevalence.
o The discussion is lengthy and mainly repeats the results.
o The conclusion does not seem to be based on the study's findings.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

To the Editor of the Journal of Microbiology,

Dear

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to inform you that I have carefully addressed the comments and suggestions provided by the esteemed reviewers. Each of their remarks has been thoughtfully incorporated into the revised manuscript. Below is a detailed outline of the responses to the reviewers' feedback:

Reply to Reviewer 1: WITH RESPECTED TO VIEWERS

1. Grammatical editing was completed, and the writing style was thoroughly checked.

2. The manuscript has been condensed, with particular attention to the discussion section, which has been shortened as requested.

3. The number of samples was added where relevant.

Reply to Reviewer 2:

The current manuscript describes the epidemiology of malaria in Rask City and surrounding areas in Southeast Iran. I have taken the following actions in response to the reviewer’s concerns:

- The study period has been clarified throughout the manuscript to ensure consistency. The period is now correctly stated as 2020-2023, and the title has been updated accordingly.

- The province's name has been added to the title for clarity.

- The abstract has been revised to include details on how malaria was diagnosed, the total number of cases, and the breakdown of cases by *Plasmodium* species and gender. Specifically, 3269 malaria cases were diagnosed during the study period, with demographic factors included in the analysis.

- Relevant statistics on the malaria situation in Iran and the study area have been added to the introduction.

- A reference has been added to the first sentence of the introduction, as requested.

- The study period mentioned at the end of the introduction was corrected to match the other sections, and it is now accurately reflected as 2020-2023.

- The second paragraph of the data collection section was moved to the results section, as suggested.

- I clarified that the methods section reflects a retrospective study based on data collected from health centers in Rask City.

- The manuscript now specifies that the data were collected from One health center and health network, one hospital, three urban centers, seven health centers, and three bases, which were involved in the study. Data Collection LINE 86-89

- The mention of Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests has been clarified. These tests refer to the rapid diagnostic method, a serological approach. This clarification was included in the methods section.

- The discussion was shortened significantly, and repeated sections were removed to avoid redundancy. The conclusion has been revised accordingly to better align with the findings of the study.

Reply to Reviewer 3:

All the suggestions and comments provided by Reviewer 3 were carefully considered and incorporated into the manuscript. These changes have been highlighted within the document for ease of reference.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their valuable input, which has greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. I kindly request that the revised manuscript be reviewed once again, and I remain open to any further suggestions or clarifications that may be required.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

M.D.

Reply of Reviewer 1. Grammatical editing was achieved. The style of writing was checked.

2. The Manuscript was condensed, especially the shortened discussion.

3- The number of samples was added.

Reviewer 2

.

o The title mentions the study period as 2020-2023, while the methods section and introduction refer to 2018-2023. Ensure consistency in the study period throughout the manuscript. If the study period is indeed 2018-2023, update the title accordingly

Reply. The first item(2020-2023) is correct, which was corrected, thanks to the honorable judge

o The title should include the name of the province. ***The name of the province was added***
o The Abstract lacks clarity on how malaria was diagnosed, the total number of cases, and the breakdown of cases by Plasmodium species and gender.

R. ***A total of 3269 cases of malaria were diagnosed in the studied years, and the species, gender, and other demographic factors were estimated based on the population of that year. Figure 1. IT was added. and rewrite***
o The introduction should present the malaria situation and relevant statistics in Iran and the study area.

R. ***Malaria situation and relevant statistics in Iran and the study area were added.***
o The first sentence of the introduction needs a reference. ***Reference added.***
o The study period mentioned at the end of the introduction is 2018-2023, which is six years, not five.

*R.****The correction for 2020-2023 has been made, all thanks to the honorable judge!***
o The second paragraph of the data collection section belongs in the discussion, not the methods. R. ***The second paragraph was taken to the results section***
o The methods section should reflect that this is a retrospective study using data from health centers in Rask City.

R. ***The manuscript now specifies that the data were collected from One health center and health network, one hospital, three urban centers, seven health centers, and three bases, which were involved in the study. Data Collection LINE 86-89***

.

o It is unclear how many health centers were involved and whether they included rural health centers.

R. ***In the methods section, it was mentioned that samples were collected from four rural health centers and one urban health center.***

o The manuscript mentions using Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests to compare seroprevalence, but there is no data on seroprevalence.

R. ***It means the rapid diagnosis method, which is a serum method, thank you***

o The discussion is lengthy and mainly repeats the results.

R. ***The discussion was shortened and repeated items were removed and reviewed together with the conclusion***

o The conclusion does not seem to be based on the study's findings. *R.* ***The discussion was shortened and repeated items were removed and reviewed together with the conclusion***

Comment to reviewer 3 was completed according to the request and it was highlit in my manuscript. and as a separate word was done.

SIN

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.