



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_15117
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroepidemiology of toxoplasmosis in pregnant women attending antenatal clinics at the centre for maternal and child health care in Daloa in Ivory Coast.
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 study describes a serological survey of <i>T. gondii</i> in pregnant women In Ivory cost. The information may be of value in the region but several issues must be considered before its possible publication. The study design is fairly simple and some evaluated risk factors are confounding. For instance, how the type of housing may influence the predisposition to became infected? Why gravidity and trimester of pregnancy are considered a risk factor? Individuals can be infected at any time being pregnant or not. Authors should report Odds Ratio and Confidence Intervals (95%) for each risk factor. What is the sensibility and specificity of the ELFA for <i>T. gondii</i>? It is very questionable why no IgM positive cases were found with that high IgG positive prevalence. With that seroprevalence, re-exposition of individuals to the parasite is very probably to occur. Why the avidity test was not considered? Avoid repeating the methodology, aims and results in the discussion section. There are no bases to say for instance, regarding the seroprevalence found in countries of the same region that "This difference could be due to variations in geographic patterns within the same country" The recommendation of a second serological test is non-founded for screening but for clinical cases. Risk factor are not discussed. The conclusion is out of context. Authors must adequate the conclusion based on the aims of the study. Please avoid repeating results in this section.	Reply to the issues Highlighted in yellow: The requests show that the reviewer did not know the realities of sub-Saharan Africa. Indeed, a factor such as the type of habitat that may not be of importance in Europe may appear very important in Africa because of its relationship with poverty. We are aware that a person can be infected at any time of life it but it is scientifically proven that a woman infected in the last trimesters pregnancy is at greater risk of transmitting the disease to her child. Finally, accordance with Title of the manuscript, risk factors are not the key information of the manuscript. These factors bring us substantial information to enhance our discussion; therefore, the analyses on risk factors are largely consistent. Reply to the issues Highlighted in red: According to Weber et al, 2010 (Scientia Medica, volume 20, número 1, p. 27-34) the sensitivity and specificity are respectively 99.5% and 98.5%, but this sensitivity may vary according to the site of analysis. There are several cases in the literature where there are some positive cases of IgG without the presence of IgM.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Reply to the issues Highlighted in blue: It's true that we could have done the avidity test but it was not part of our objectives. Reply to the issues Highlighted in green: There are several scientific papers presented so. it is a reminder and a form of emphasis.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References are written in different styles. Ethical issues: Authors reports an approval of the Research National Ethics Committee before implementation. All participants provided written informed consent	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend the manuscript to be adequate and considered as a short communication considering the observations above mentioned.	The manuscript is not in accordance with a short communication by definition. This is a research paper that was inspired by several works of literature (see references). The manuscripts may not be considered as a short communication. The added value of this manuscript is that it describes the prevalence of maternal health importance of disease described for the first time in a region of a developing country. The conclusion is in line with the objective of the authors.