



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR’S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors’ response to final evaluator’s comments
The authors have responded to some of the concerns raised. However I am not satisfied, with the level of corrections. I still have the following issues with the paper. i. The abstract is not restructured into aim, methodology, result and conclusion. ii. The authors do not follow the referencing style of the journal iii. All the research findings can be categorized into 2 classes i.e. qualitative and quantitative. See a decision table below: The authors may or may not have a model, but the data can be arranged in a categorical style that can fit very well into contingency table. This is a qualitative research, there is no doubt about that ANOVA is for quantitative. Authors can make reference to any textbook of statistics. The results are presented in percentile and the claimed confidence intervals and ranges seem to be determined from the combination of parameters without given preference to the categorization of the parameters. Furthermore, there is need for grammatical review. The values of GMPD/μl on table 2 for sex, age and social class can be analyzed using ANOVA. And in that case, the mean STD, SEM and variance of GMPD/μl must be calculated. Other values on table 2 can be analyzed using chi-square. Provide references at the end of line 37,	i)) The abstract is structured according to authors’ instructions found on the web page (http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors) into aim, study design, place and duration of study, methodology, results and conclusion . The references have been edited to agree with the guidelines to authors. We thank the reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions concerning Table 2. We have modified the table by removing the confidence intervals as well as removing values for socio-economic status and presented them in a figure (1) as requested. The other figures have been re-numbered. However, we have maintained the statistics in the tables in order to give this manuscript the scientific value that it deserves. We strongly disagree with the over-simplified and multiple versions of contingency tables (see tables by the reviewer below) as suggested by the reviewer as they appear to be below a scientific level of reporting in a valued journal. We also prefer to use ranges for GMPDs instead of SDs and SEM because values for GMPDs have been normalized and the log transformed values were used in the analysis. In some cases the values for SD and SEM could be larger than the GMPD, thus giving a wrong impression. We hope that we have explained our case in clear terms. Once more thanks for your understanding. We state categorically that the values have been presented in percentages and not percentiles as indicated by the reviewer. This information is verifiable and we wish to advice the reviewer to verify the confidence intervals presented by using the calculator soft ware that can be downloaded free of charge online. The manuscript has been thoroughly reviewed and the minor grammatical errors corrected. The appropriate statistics has been used in table 2. The GMPD for sex was compared using the appropriate test (t – test) not ANOVA as requested by the reviewer. Line 37 has been referenced. See line 36 The reason why 386 cases were used in the comparison instead of 406 has been included in the manuscript (see section 3.1).