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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
The abstract should be shortened to be not more than 250 words. The highlights of the results with both computational and statistical values of data obtained should be reflected.

In the Methods, Data analysis should be recasted. Only indicate how data were analyzed and statistical methods used.

The entire result should be recasted. The result section should be an interpretation and description of what is obtained in the tables, this was not done. The tables should be interpreted and described systematically and sequentially in the results. The actual characteristics of the respondents should be described as represented in table 1. Parity status of the women should if possible be included as one of the characteristics. Percentages and statistical values of data obtained as well as values of levels of significance should be reflected. All results should reflect pre and post peer education survey and should also include all women of reproductive age involved in this study to completely capture the title of the study.

Discussion should be based on the actual results obtained in this study. All the results should be taken one after the other and elaborately discussed based on bringing out the highlights of the results, comparing with results from previous studies and stating possible reasons for the present results.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Background
second paragraph, line 3; "Sulphadoxine Pirymethamine" should read "Sulphadoxine Pyrimethamine"

Methods
Study Population
Line 3 should read "consent was asked from 2112 eligible women"
Line 6 Should read "post assessment" and not "post measurement"

Result
Knowledge on Malaria
Paragraph 2, second sentence should be recasted to make sense

Discussion
Paragraph 1, First line should read "preventive measure uptake" and not preventative measure uptake"
Paragraphs 3 and 4 should be recasted to make more sense

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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