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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 manuscript addresses a significantly relevant public health issue — the knowledge, attitudes, practices, and barriers related to malaria diagnosis and treatment among healthcare providers in Nigeria. The findings contribute valuable data about gaps in adherence to the national protocols and the socio-demographic factors affecting treatment practices, which are critical for designing interventions to enhance malaria control. The emphasis on enabling and constraining factors, such as relevant drug availability and patient compliance, provides actionable insights for policymakers and program designers. Given the persistent burden of malaria in sub-Saharan Africa, this work is important for the scientific and public health community. | **Thank you for the comments.** |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title is **clear, descriptive, and accurate** — it reflects the:   * **Population studied**: alternative healthcare providers * **Location**: Enugu North LGA, Nigeria * **Focus**: knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) regarding malaria diagnosis and treatment   It is typical for public health research to follow this “KAP study in [population] in [location]” structure, so the title is acceptable.  **Suggestions for improvement:**  That said, the title is **quite long** and could be made slightly more concise and polished while retaining all key elements. Here are some alternative suggestions:   1. **Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Regarding Malaria Diagnosis and Treatment Among Alternative Healthcare Providers in Enugu North, Nigeria** 2. **Malaria Diagnosis and Treatment: Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of Alternative Healthcare Providers in Enugu North, Nigeria** 3. **Assessing Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of Alternative Healthcare Providers on Malaria Diagnosis and Treatment in Enugu North LGA, Nigeria** 4. **Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Malaria Management Among Alternative Healthcare Providers in Enugu North, Nigeria Why these alternatives?**     * More natural word order (e.g., *regarding* or *on* instead of “of”).    * Replacing “Local Government Area” with just “Enugu North, Nigeria” keeps it concise since “Enugu North” already refers to an LGA. | **Thank you for the comments.** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  Avoids redundancy and improves readability. |  |
| **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 is reasonably comprehensive and includes background, methods, results, and conclusion. * However, it could be improved by: * Reporting key quantitative results (e.g., percentages, odds ratios, or p-values) directly in the abstract. * Stating the study design explicitly (e.g., *"cross-sectional survey"*). * Making the conclusion more specific, highlighting both the knowledge gaps and actionable recommendations. * For example, the final lines of the abstract could specify that *training programs and supply chain improvements are needed to address identified gaps.* | **Thank you for the comments.** |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | * The manuscript is scientifically sound overall. The study design (descriptive cross-sectional) is appropriate, and the results are logically presented. * Tables and statistical analyses (logistic regression) are adequate, though clarification of the statistical model assumptions and handling of confounders would strengthen the rigor. | **Thank you for the comments.** |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | * The references are sufficient, recent, and relevant, covering both regional and international literature. * The inclusion of WHO guidelines and national policy documents is appropriate. * Minor suggestion: include one or two more recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses on KAP of malaria management if available (post-2022). | **Thank you for the comments.** |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | * The English language is understandable but can be improved for flow and scholarly style. * Some sentences in the discussion are lengthy and would benefit from editing for clarity and conciseness. * Grammar and punctuation errors are minimal but should still be addressed in revision. | **Thank you for the comments.** |
| **Optional/General** comments | This manuscript discussed an important and timely topic, exploring the knowledge, attitudes, practices, and barriers to malaria diagnosis and treatment among alternative healthcare providers in Nigeria. The research question is clear and appropriate, the methods are acceptable, and the findings contribute valuable information to the field of malaria control and public health policy.  The manuscript is well-structured and cited by sufficient and recent references. The statistical analyses (e.g., logistic regression) are relevant, but clarifying the rationale for model selection and discussing potential confounders would strengthen the findings.  The language is appropriate, though some sentences—particularly in the discussion—are long and could benefit from editing for clarity and conciseness. Improving the abstract by including more specific quantitative findings and clearly stating the study design would also improve the manuscript.  Overall, this is a reasonably good contribution to the literature and, with minor revisions, will be suitable for publication. | **Thank you for the comments.** |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |