



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
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

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Malaria species can be reported by microscopic examination. Only positive <i>P. falciparum</i> cases by microscopy and RDT should be considered as true positive. Sensitivity and specific of the RDT should be evaluated from the corrected TP because this test does not detect other malaria parasites. 2. The confusion of prevalence should be removed from Table 1. Malaria prevalence by microscopic examination must be re-calculated (Positive by microscopy was 159 as shown in table 3). 3. The findings in this article were reduplicated and described in discussion without any reason and evidence. 4. Many references were written in wrong format. 5. Figure 1 and 2 are redundant.	1. Only <i>P. falciparum</i> were considered in this study because the RDT does not detect the other species of malaria. 2. The column for overall malaria prevalence in table 1 if deleted will create confusion. All readers may not understand why the prevalence varied if they cannot appreciate the disparity in numbers examined. Positive by microscopy was 158 and not 159. 3. The results that are mentioned in the discussion have been deleted and the sentences have been rephrased and highlighted in yellow. 4. References have been corrected. 5. Figure 1 compares prevalence of malaria by RDT and microscopy and figure 2 compares the two methods in relation to GMPD.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Information on Malaria species that are endemic in this study area should be introduced. 2. Describe the criteria for classification of social class	1. <i>Plasmodium falciparum</i> is the species that is endemic in sub-Saharan Africa. This information has been added to the introduction and highlighted. 2. Social class classification has been addressed in the responses to the second reviewer's comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	PLEASE CLARIFY THE ETHICAL ISSUE, IF ANY	This has been done and highlighted.