



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Study design, problem statement needed reworking. ?secondary data obtained from DATASUS could probably have answered the problem and hence save on resources! Or is incidence/prevalence not captured? This has left author shy of having nothing to report – too few outcome – hampering the range of tests that could be run. Why not do an evaluation of DATASUS? so as to try out several correlations. Alternatively, and in order to conclude as you have done (which is wrong since your findings are not generalizable-due to scale and design), author could have scaled up to include wider coverage and sampled from this wider population.	We tried to improve the writing to clarify these sections. The main goal of our study is the comparison of our results to DATASUS and show the discrepancies. We claim that the notification system is flawed, which is corroborated by our findings. With only DATASUS data this comparison could not be done. The official data is supposed to include cases from the entire population. We used, within a period, data from all childbirth in a public maternity facility and we proceed with the comparison. We believe that the English revision that was done will improve readability and understanding of our work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		