



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please have this manuscript edited by an individual familiar with the English language. Specific issues: Abstract- study design – the word facility should be inserted after “public maternity” This needs to be corrected throughout the manuscript Abstract results – CS should be spelled out here. Introduction – lines 30 – 33. This sentence is too long, please break this information into 2 sentences Line 37. The sentence “Laboratory confirmation with treponemal tests, even though being decisive is not mandatory” is confusing. Please clarify this statement. Methods section 2.3.2.3 The authors need to be more specific about what questions were asked in these interviews. If the clinical questions pertain to variables in Table1 then the authors could mention that in this section. Results and Discussion Line 107 The authors should specify what they consider as the major change in 2007. If they are referring to the dramatic increases in the number of cases nationwide could they please comment on why this may have occurred?	Revised. Revised throughout the manuscript. Revised and corrected. Sentence reformulated. Sentence improved. Table 1 is now Table 03. All the variables in the 03 are from the interview questions. This information was also added to the section 2.3.2.3 The proper comments for this dramatic change are now appended to the line.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 119 “The discrepant findings of syphilis in different regions of the country reflected the differences in structuring, monitoring, investment....” This is a very important but broad statement without any specific information to support this conclusion. A table illustrating some of this information by region would be helpful and would clarify how the authors arrived at their conclusions. Line 139 what does “non-reagents mean? Does this mean non-reactive or negative? Line 159, Table 1. If the authors have demographic information from these women it would be useful to add to this Table. Line 162 “from Woman 3, who did not perform prenatal or therapy.....” should read from Woman 3 who sis not receive prenatal care or therapy.....” Line 163 “Previous works have shown that titrations (1:02) should be considered” The way this sentence is written is confusing. Do the authors mean that titrations of 1:02 should be considered positive or suspect since the presence of maternal antibodies in neonatal serum can produce false positive or false negative results?	Although the sentence is correct, the supportive necessary data would lead to the additional of social and education information reflecting the differences among Brazilian regions. This would mislead the original idea of the manuscript. Given that we decided to remove the sentence. The word means “non-reactive” Unfortunately we don’t have additional information, and considering the anonymity nature of the study, it’s now impossible to reach out the participants to collect more data. Revised and corrected. Sentence was improved.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This manuscript covers a very significant problem and merits publication. However, the English is poorly edited. There are sentences in various sections of the manuscript that are not clear. There are also some typographical or syntax errors that need to be corrected. These issues severely detract the merit of the work.	English was revised and typographical mistakes corrected.