



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6788
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF COMBINED QUININE AND CIPROFLOXACIN THERAPY IN EXPERIMENTAL MURINE PLASMODIASIS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors present results suggesting that a ciprofloxacin/quinine combination therapy may be promising in areas with multidrug resistance. However, they show no proof that this combination is effective against resistant <i>P. berghei</i>. A key issue rose when comparing the results of Abolghasem, E. et al, 2012: the radically different dose sensitivity for quinine. How do the authors rationalize this difference? In several places the authors state that “significant reduction” was demonstrated (lines 29 and 297). I believe it is important to specify which statistical program was use in analysis.	We are hoping that further work will lead us to working with resistant <i>P. berghei</i>. We hope we have been able to prove the efficacy of the combination. A lot of reasons explain the reasons for the possible difference in dose sensitivity of quinine. The complex dose regiment makes it difficult for most people to adhere strictly. If we are sure of what we used, we cannot be sure of others. Quinine generally has presented some problems of late when used for malaria treatment that it is no longer reliable. The statement we made on significant reduction was based on the percentage reduction of the parasites observed. We agree with your suggestion and have decided to change the word significant with reasonable. In our other similar publications, your suggestion will guide us. We appreciate you



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The manuscript contains several stylistics errors or incorrect or confusing statements, e.g. on line 21 ("varying does" should be "varying doses"); line 51 ("liver and brian"; presumably the authors mean brain?); line 300 (2.9 mg/ml; presumably the authors mean 12.9 mg/ml?)	All corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The text should be revised for spelling errors.	The text has been revised for spelling errors
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Considering the significant impact of resistance problem this kind of research is highly relevant. However, poor editing contribute to impression that there has been a lack of attention to detail.	