

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Perspectives of Microbiology and Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2519
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Saliva and Urine Performance for Antimalarial Drug Resistance Molecular Markers Study
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores innovative, non-invasive diagnostic methods for malaria, specifically through the analysis of saliva and urine samples. By demonstrating the potential of these alternative biological samples to detect Plasmodium falciparum DNA, the study addresses cultural and logistical barriers associated with blood sampling, thereby enhancing accessibility to malaria diagnostics. Furthermore, the findings contribute to the ongoing efforts to improve malaria detection methods, which is crucial for effective disease management and control, particularly in endemic regions	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title "Assessment of Saliva and Urine Performance for Antimalarial Drug Resistance Molecular Markers Study" is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the research.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it provides a clear overview of the study's background, methodology, results, and conclusions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis. The use of nested PCR for the amplification of specific molecular markers related to antimalarial drug resistance ensures precise detection, while the comparison of multiple biological samples (blood, saliva, and urine) provides a thorough evaluation of diagnostic efficacy. The statistical analyses, including the use of z-score tests and appropriate significance thresholds (p < 0.05), further validate the findings and support the conclusions drawn. Additionally, the inclusion of a diverse patient profile enhances the generalizability of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript uses technical terminology appropriately, which is essential for conveying complex scientific concepts clearly to a specialized audience	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nilesh Mandloi
Department, University & Country	GRY Institute of Pharmacy, India