



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_18872
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of nontreponemal positive test in women at childbirth in a maternity in the central region of Rondonia state, Brazil
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Not much has been done to clear the confusions but just minor corrections here and there. Lot of questions still remain unanswered and the major ones are as follows: 1. The topic does not encompass the objectives and the findings. 2. The evaluation of 300 women in 3 months with 5 VDRL positive women cannot be compared with the data of the country for last 7 yrs...Your findings are not enough to compare and justify the national reporting/data. 3. It would have been better to compare the national data of the 3 months that you did the VDRL testing (both testing for 3 months and review the national data for the 3 same months)....this could come somewhere close to comparing the national data and making comments As much as I encourage such researches, I see that the objectives and the final outcome have been dissected from the topic of the research. This paper will look better if the authors stick to the topic. I mean just finding the incidence of VDRL positive among the childbirth in that state....but not go on to make the comparison and comments on the national data. In fact I would recommend the authors to do an overall re-write up with this aim and resubmit it as a new manuscript. Thank you and sorry for not getting your point. I understand it is sometimes difficult to make someone come to agreement with your thoughts.	Thank you for your valuable comments I believe in this review round we were able to understand better your concerns and we tried to organize the manuscript following the suggestions. We understand that our results are not comparable to national data, and it seems that the flaw in the notification system already reported should be addressed in another work maybe a survey on the subject can support such conclusion. We focused on the results we have as suggested, but we disagree on submitting another manuscript, especially because of the suggestions of the other 4 reviewers who also agreed that improving the current manuscript is possible and feasible. Please, you don't have to apologize. We are tremendously thankful to your comments and we try to address each of the suggestions as much as we can.