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PART 1: Comments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This study sheds light on how aware pregnant women in rural Abia State, Nigeria, are about intermittent preventive treatment for malaria (IPTp-SP) and how often they use it, tackling a major public health challenge in a region where malaria is common. It points out real-world issues, like limited access to drugs and low awareness, which can help shape better health programs to protect mothers and babies. By focusing on rural areas, it provides practical data that local policymakers can use to improve antenatal care. Overall, it’s a valuable step toward reducing malaria’s impact on pregnant women and highlights the need for stronger health education and systems. | Thank you |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is clear, but I think it could better reflect the study’s focus on knowledge and actual use of IPTp-SP. I suggest:  "Knowledge and Use of Intermittent Preventive Treatment for Malaria in Pregnancy in Rural Abia State, Nigeria" | Thank you for this suggestion but the topic is perfectly okay and reflects the study’s focus |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.** | The abstract does a good job summarizing the study, but it could be sharper. I recommend adding a specific statistic (e.g., the 80.8% awareness rate) to give a quick sense of the findings. Mentioning the rural Nigerian context briefly would also set the stage. To keep it concise, you could trim some wordy phrases and consider noting a key limitation, like reliance on self-reported data. For example, you might say: “In rural Abia State, Nigeria, 80.8% of pregnant women knew about IPTp-SP, but only 26.3% used it optimally, limited by drug shortages and low awareness.” This would make the abstract more precise and engaging. | Statistics are well stated in the abstract |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript is solid scientifically. It uses a well-designed cross-sectional study, appropriate statistical tools (like Chi-square and Pearson correlation), and its findings align with existing research, such as the 2018 Nigeria Demographic Health Survey and a 2019 Ebonyi State study. The reported 80.8% awareness and 26.3% optimal IPTp-SP usage make sense, and barriers like lack of awareness (19.4%) are believable. | Thank you |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are decent and include relevant sources, like WHO guidelines (2019, 2022) and Nigerian studies on IPTp-SP from 2012 to 2025. However, the manuscript could benefit from a few more recent studies to better connect its findings to the broader context of malaria prevention in Nigeria.  I suggest adding:   1. Ajayi, I. O., et al. (2021). Factors associated with the uptake of Intermittent Preventive Treatment (IPTp- SP) for malaria in pregnancy: Further analysis of the 2018 Nigeria Demographic Health Survey. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 1(8), e0000771. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000771 2. Okedo-Alex, I. N., et al. (2019). Uptake of intermittent preventive treatment for malaria in pregnancy among women in selected communities of Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 19(1),   465. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-2629-4   1. Akinleye, S. O., et al. (2021). Decomposition of socioeconomic inequalities in the uptake of intermittent preventive treatment of malaria in pregnancy in Nigeria: Evidence from the 2018 Demographic Health Survey. *Malaria Journal*, 20(1), 326. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-021-03834-8 2. Udenze, C. C., et al. (2024). Determinants of the optimal uptake of sulfadoxine–pyrimethamine doses for intermittent treatment of malaria in pregnancy in urban Nigeria. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 2437. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-52927-2   These would help ground the study in the latest research and show how it fits into the bigger picture. | Thank you |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language is generally clear, but there are a few minor issues, like repetitive wording, some overly long sentences, and a couple of typos. These don’t detract from the science but could make the manuscript feel less polished. A quick revision to streamline sentences and fix small errors would bring it up to the standard expected for a scholarly journal. | Okay |
| **Optional/General** comments | This is a strong study with clear relevance for malaria prevention in pregnancy, and it’s well-positioned to contribute to public health efforts in Nigeria. To make it even better, I suggest:   1. Adding a short section on limitations, such as potential recall bias from self-reported data or the fact that the study only includes women attending antenatal clinics. 2. Expanding on how to put the recommendations into action—for example, specific ideas for improving drug availability or training healthcare workers to be more supportive. 3. Explaining what makes Abia State unique compared to other Nigerian regions to highlight the study’s distinct contribution.   With these tweaks, the manuscript will be even clearer and more impactful. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |