



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I would like to congratulate the authors for initiating and completing this research since I understand from this manuscript that syphilis is a major public health concern in Brazil. It really needs some research that the policy makers can use for planning and implementation to achieve the goal of eradication of the disease in the country. But as a manuscript for this reputed journal I have the following concerns: • The title does not convey the message of the research and is confusing • The findings and conclusions are a little confusing in regards to the aims and the topic of the research. • The objectives of the research have not been met with the analysis of just 300 women and compare to the national data for the last so many years • Pregnancy is one of the causes of false positive VDRL test and any positive VDRL test should be confirmed with treponema specific tests to confirm as syphilis. In this study only VDRL was done and this is not a laboratory confirmation of syphilis in both mother and newborn. • The manuscript needs to be seen by an English expert for major language corrections • • I am not a statistician but I feel statistical analysis is poor and	Thanks. We tried to change words to improve the title. Our main goal is to compare the results of our experiment with the official data as shown in lines 173-182. We tried to improve the writing to have it clarified. That is true. Even though, official data in Brazil uses VDRL as parameter for syphilis (This is being changed, but the official data available is of VDRL). We had to use VDRL to be able to compare. English was revised. We used the entire sample space instead of a randomized test as was said before.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	this needs to be seen by a statistician • There is an overall need for rewording the topic, reorganization of the write up and refining results and conclusions as per the aims of the research	We hope that the adjusts we made, meet up with this comment.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		