



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>                                                                                                        |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2014_IJTDH_10778                                                                                                                                                              |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessing the Performance Characteristics of the “CareStart™ Malaria HRP2 pf (CAT NO: G0141, ACCESSBIO)” Rapid Diagnostic Test for Asymptomatic Malaria in Mutengene-Cameroon |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article                                                                                                                                                     |

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 4: 406 had microscopy while 386 had microscopy and RDT, but the number used for analysis was not clearly indicated.</li> <li>2. Suggest you reduce the length of whole article; basic definitions can be removed; table 4 shows the necessary characteristics of the RDT hence Table 3 can be removed.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Line 4: 406 participants in the study. This has been explained in the review comments of the first reviewer.</li> <li>2. Table 3 has been removed and table four has been re-numbered as table 3.</li> </ol> |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | A good article that can inform policy making and modifications.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Thank you                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |