



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13391
Title of the Manuscript:	Therapeutic arsenal against leishmaniasis: a review
Type of the Article	Review 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	This is a competent review on the chemotherapy of Leishmaniasis. The authors have assembled a large amount of useful information in this manuscript.	On behalf of all authors, thank you for your time and comments. It was a hard work, as we hope to contribute to the scientific community. We also hope that our paper now meets the exacting requirements for acceptance for publication in IJTDH.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Abbreviations need to be defined when first used e.g. WHO line 9, DNDi line 36 2. It is preferable to give as reference the printed rather than on-line version. E.g. reference 3 Control of the leishmaniasis: report of a meeting of the WHO Expert Committee on the Control of Leishmaniases, Geneva, <i>World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser.</i> 1990;793:1-158. 3. Use of English could be improved e.g. Line 35 Instead of "thus suffer a sub-classification" better to say "this form is known as" Line 39 Instead of "declaring" use "notification of" Line 49 Instead of "leishmaniasis form of manifestation of" use "of the form of manifestation of leishmaniasis" 4. Line 38 Countries should not be referred to as "underdeveloped". Better to use World Bank classification "low and middle	1. We agree and corrected it. 2. We agree and corrected it. 3. We agree and corrected it. 4. We agree and corrected it. 5. We agree and corrected it. 6. We agree and corrected it. 7. We agree and included some important considerations about this. 8. Perhaps it was not clear, but we would you like to emphasize that the details regarding the topical treatment would be presented in a specific chapter of the manuscript, entitled: TOPIC TREATMENT OF AMERICAN TEGUMENTARY LEISHMANIASIS LESIONS. To avoid any confusion, we changed this sentence to: "will be discussed in the relevant chapter of



SDI Review Form 1.6

	income countries" 5. Key words missing e.g. line 41 90% of new cases line 47 human invasion line 149 are not administered line 197 co-infected patients 6. Availability of drugs Line 79-80 my understanding is that glucantime is no longer available from Aventis and neither is Pentostam available from Glaxo Wellcome. The authors should check on the current availability of these drugs. 7. Conclusion Perhaps the conclusion could include a brief discussion on the costs of developing new drugs and what mechanisms could be used to make any leishmania drug affordable to the target population. 8. I have checked the manuscript using the iThenticate software and there are no major plagiarism issues with this manuscript as detected by this software. However there is a reference in line 228 "will be discussed in the relevant chapter " which makes me wonder if parts of this manuscript have not been copied from a book.	this manuscript ("Topic Treatment of American Tegumentary Leishmaniasis Lesions ")." We hope that the sentence is clearer for you understand. *All the changes from your comments are highlighted in blue.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There appears to be formatting errors in the PDF file causing spaces between words to be deleted e.g. lines 16, 23, 24, 26, 27 and throughout the manuscript.	For some reason, the file was unformatted, to which we apologize. We give attention to this in the new document formatting. The manuscript was also completely revised by a native, as suggested by one of the reviewers. These changes are highlighted in yellow.