



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_30277
Title of the Manuscript:	Reliability of a rapid test for diagnosing malaria in people living with human immunodeficiency virus infection in Cameroon
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	• Explain the objective of the study clearly in the abstract • Re-write the abstract • What are the main objective of the study? Please explain in the introduction section • What are the gaps the authors trying to fill? Explain • In this section, you have to review some previous works. There are works done by Ayele and other researchers. Please extend the review part. • Please explain detailed sampling procedure or refer to a document for the explanation • The statistical analysis is not sufficient ent. Please perform another advanced statistical model analysis • There are many studies conducted on RDT test. Please compare your result in comparison to previous studies.	▪ Objectives of the study have been explained again in the abstract as recommended by the reviewer. ▪ We re-write the abstract as recommended by the reviewer. ▪ The main objectives of the study have been clearly explained in the introduction section as recommended by the reviewer. ▪ We re-wrote the introduction as recommended by the reviewer. ▪ We are grateful to the reviewer for the proposition about works done by Ayele and colleagues. These authors have been used to extend this part along with the discussion as recommended. ▪ Dear reviewer, we reckon the statistical analyses are sufficient given the large body of research articles we have consulted and used to complete our paper and with the aim to compare our results to theirs. These authors used the same methods that those used in the paper. Analysis methods (Generalized additive models, GAM) used by Ayele and colleagues are very interesting. However, we think they are beyond the scope of our study. In the next coming years, we think to use these models in our context in collaboration with colleagues from south Africa as Ayele Dawit and others



SDI Review Form 1.6

		colleagues. ▪ Our results have been compared to previous studies as recommended.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		All authors are grateful to the reviewer for proofreading our manuscript.