



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18744
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection and species identification of malaria parasites by nested-PCR: comparison with light microscopy and with SD BIOLINE Malaria Ag test in Luanda, Angola.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript is very interesting and relevant, pointing out the fragility of microscopy as gold standard and using better tools as molecular tests as the reference. All topics were very well written and in clear way. There are few modifications needed like typing errors and some sentences should be improved for better understanding also, some revision in the reference part are needed (highlighted in yellow, comments are in the boxes in the manuscript PDF). Highlighted and comments: Abstract • Abstract conclusion: Used the RDT-change by using RDT • Abstract conclusion: I am sorry I did not understand this part- "This study contribute to the less literature regarding malaria species in Angola" Introduction • Line 21: This part is not necessary (with an uncertainty range of 124 million to 283 million) • Line 22: This part is not necessary (with an uncertainty range of 367 000 to 755 000) • Line 25: WHO, 2014. This is ref#5 so this one in parenthesis has to be removed from the text • Line 49: space after 17. • Line 53: change elimination by eliminate • Line 66: Plasmodium spp. Infection in Luanda..... It is a new sentences Methodology • Lines 87 and 88: We considered positive whose slides	Thank you very much for your comments; with these the paper leaves great quality. We hope answer all comments and insert in the manuscript from rich that. Was changes The sentence was changed. "This study contributes to wide knowledge about the presence of <i>Plasmodium</i> species in Angola." Was deleted Was deleted Was deleted Space added Was done No, was changed. Plasmodium spp. infection in Luanda..... Was changed according to the referee suggestion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	resulted positive for two or more technicians. Changed by: Slides were considered as positive only after being confirmed by two of more technicians. This phrase is not necessary: The rest are negative - Line 111: minikit- two words - Lines 120, 124, 125. The primers used in the first amplification are different from the ones informed in Table 1. - Line 161: Two more space Results - Figure 1. It is difficult to read what is written on the figure. The gel image is clear but not the writing - Line 199: Plasmodium and its species must be written in different letter from the text. Discussion - Line 253: P. falciparum ITALIC - Line 283: falciparum Plasmodium ITALIC References - Line 353: Check the correct position for year, because reference 5 it appear WHO 2014 and the year it as the end. - Change , by ; in references 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 39, 50 - The title of the reference 27 require revision Reference 52: Year location is different from the other reference	Was deleted. Was separated. Mini kit. The text was changed. The primers are rPLU1 and rPLU5 as Table 1. The space was deleted The figure was changed Was changed Was done Was done The year is at the end. Was changed in reference 5. The reference 16 is OK. Was done Was done Was accommodate at the end, also ; was changed by ,
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		