



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_28331
Title of the Manuscript:	Association between Malaria Prevalence and Seropositivity of Immunoglobulin G Subtypes Directed to Plasmodium falciparum Merozoite Surface Protein 1-19
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 subject of manuscript is relevant despite there is no news in the results. It should be published. However, minor revision is necessary.	
Minor REVISION comments	-The authors evaluated malaria infection at the moment of the study, but not the malaria previous. Why? - In "General Characteristics of study participants and malaria positivity", the IgG0 prevalence is 87% instead 87.00. - It is necessary to correct the numbers of some tables in the text: line 118 – table 2 instead 3, line 121- table 3, line 123-table 4 instead 3 - The authors do not should putting the data displayed in the tables also into the text. - The table 2 is not necessary and should be	-COMMENT1: -The authors evaluated malaria infection at the moment of the study, but not the malaria previous. Why? -RESPONSE: We measured antibody responses and determined malaria infection at the time of sample collection since our study was designed as a cross sectional study. In cross sectional study designs, sampling is done in a 'snapshot' style whereby only samples collected AT the time of sampling are analysed for the study parameters. -COMMENT2: - In "General Characteristics of study participants and malaria positivity", the IgG0 prevalence is 87% instead 87.00. RESPONSE: changed in the text --COMMENT3: It is necessary to correct the numbers of some tables in the text: line 118 – table 2 instead 3, line 121- table 3, line 123-table 4 instead 3 RESPONSE: Changed as advised COMMENT4: - The authors do not should putting the data displayed in the tables also into the text. - The table 2 is not necessary and should be removed RESPONSE: We have removed detailed descriptions of tables 2 and 3 and retained the tables as they contain 'significant' information. We think we have to retain Table 2 because it summarises malaria prevalence data, which may not be presented by text alone. This is important for the reader to get 'handy information' before detailed analyses are presented.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	removed - The authors should to include the p value into all the tables - There are many tables. It is not necessary. - Table 4 – The result of malaria prevalence was based on which diagnostic test? - The note below the table 4 is not necessary.	-COMMENT5: The authors should to include the p value into all the tables RESPONSE: We have indicated statistics used and respective p values for tables that present data on analyses of either associations or differences. Such data is presented in Tables 4,5 and 6. We feel that tables 1,2 3 should not have p values since they present descriptive statistics alone, and not analyses that call for determination of associations or differences etc - COMMENT6: There are many tables. It is not necessary. RESPONSE: This study involved analyses of many parameters; seropositivity of 4 IgG subtypes plus Total IgG, versus age categories, gender and malaria. Analyses of all these parameters necessitated having the presented number of tables. We feel that, this was necessary to ensure that our data is adequately presented and provides details about our findings. - COMMENT7: Table 4 – The result of malaria prevalence was based on which diagnostic test? RESPONSE: Legend added below the table to show that “malaria positivity was based on microscopy” , the gold standard for malaria diagnosis - COMMENT8: The note below the table 4 is not necessary. RESPONSE: Note has been removed, but a new legend added as per reviewers comment, see above response - COMMENT9: Limitations of the study should be included on the discussion RESPONSE: a statement of study limitation has been added as advised although it is not clearly shown to be a journal requirement. We added the statement ‘Although our study is limited by its cross sectional design when it comes to measuring protection, our findings are still valuable and provide important clues regarding IgG subtype responses
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Limitations of the study should be included on the discussion	against an important malaria vaccine candidate molecule, MSP1-19'.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		We are so pleased for the review comments we have received from reviewers. 1. We have addressed all comments as required by the reviewers. We have revised the documents when we agreed to the comments given; but we explained when required to do so. 2. In addition to the comments, we have attended to minor corrections that might have been quickly noted by reviewers, e.g. grammatical typographical errors. We also made small corrections in tables 4& 5 for precision. NOTE: In the process of revising the manuscript, line numbers might have changed We feel we have satisfied the reviewers requirements as far as this manuscript is concerned.