



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The introduction would need overhauling, as there is no flow in the writing at all. A good English speaker may help. Also, there was no clear justification on why such work should be done. Any peculiarity in diagnosis of malaria parasite in HIV patients? Importantly, I observed that only one product of RDT was used, whereas there are many products with varied antigens that should be accommodated in the work. The product used had MSP1 and CSP as antigen, whereas many RDTs had PfHRP antigen in its make. If reliability is been tested then, its to the product tested, not to RDT in general. This is a fundamental flaw in the work. I suggest that the topic be reframed to reflect only the RDT product he used.	- The introduction section has been improved as recommended by the reviewer. - We have clearly stated the gap in knowledge the study wants to fill along with its justification as recommended by the reviewer. - We reframed the topic of the paper as recommended by the reviewer.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The work is not properly communicated. Poor English? PPV, PLVIH should be defined in the abstract.	These words (PPV, PLWHIV, NPV, HIV, etc.) have been break down as recommended by the reviewers.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		All authors are grateful to the reviewer for proofreading our manuscript.