



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_5029
Title of the Manuscript:	Neurocysticercosis: A Health Burden in Nepal and Other Developing Countries

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have incompletely taken into account the comments of the reviewer. If the authors do not agree with some of the suggestions of the reviewer, they should explain why. • The abstract is still too general and does not contain data on the current prevalence of human and porcine cysticercosis and human taeniasis in Nepal as well as on the actions which are undertaken to prevent and control the disease in the country. • Important papers on the prevention of cysticercosis in Nepal (Joshi et al (2001). South east Asian J Trop Med Publ Hlth 32 (suppl 2): 94-97.; Joshi et al. (2003) Acta Trop 87: 119-127.) are not cited. These papers deal with meat inspection, which – if carried out correctly - is an important factor in the prevention of human taeniasis and consequently also neurocysticercosis. Improved meat inspection in Nepal is an aspect which should be included in this review paper. • The authors do not mention which techniques were used to obtain the prevalence figures of porcine cysticercosis and taeniasis (lines 109-110). It makes a big difference if the figure of 32.5% porcine cysticercosis was obtained by tongue or meat inspection or by serological tests. Similarly, the figure of 10-50% taeniasis, which is extremely high, needs some explanation. • Lines 227-232: the reference which is cited is outdated (Diaz et al, 1992). More recent research shows that the sensitivity and the Antibody detection ELISA depend on the antigen and the type of assay which is used (Dorny et al., 2003. Acta trop 87: 79-86; Carod et al., 2012. Diagn Micr Inf Dis 72: 85-89). Please clarify that the whole paragraph concerns the antibody detection ELISA. • Lines 235-236: please cite reference for the antigen detection ELISA. Other remarks: • Line 232: <i>Hymenolepsis nana</i> and <i>Eichhonococcus granulosus</i> are parasites which do not exist. Please replace by <i>Hymenolepis nana</i> and <i>Echinococcus granulosus</i>. • Tables 1 and 2: Please explain abbreviations in legend	Abstract is general because it is a review. We submitted this paper as a review rather than a research article. We are requesting the editors to reclassify it. As you can see, there isn't a good set of prevalence data that can be incorporated in the abstract. We have cited these articles although they are somewhat unrelated to our focus. Thank you. This has been clarified. The new reference has been incorporated. Thank you for the suggestion. We have fixed the typographical error. Explanation added (foot note the tables)