



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_43271
Title of the Manuscript:	A cross sectional serologic and epidemiological study of dengue virus infection in north central area of Trinidad and Tobago.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

**PART 2:**

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The study is good and very relevant to the area. The authors' revision is also acceptable. To maintain the standard, the authors need to consider the corrections pointed out.</p> <p>NO major revision is required but the simple ones pointed out are necessary for the sake of the authors and the Journal.</p>	<p>Again the authors are very much indebted to the reviewer for the thorough review of this paper. The suggestions and comments by the reviewer has been made and the particulars areas reads as follows:</p> <p><b>Line 81 - 83: It is better you state what exactly you did. Be specific:</b> The blood samples were allowed to clot at room temperature, centrifuged and separated as soon as possible <b>the same day for the rapid kits (Panbio and SD Bioline).</b> They were then stored at 2-8°C for a maximum of two days or stored frozen at -30°C until complete testing <b>using the ELISA kits that were performed in batches.</b></p> <p><b>Line 165: This is too heavy considering your sample size and methods. Why not use 'study'?</b> This has been done and it now reads as follows: The objective of this study was to use serological analysis to <b>determine the</b> frequency of dengue virus infection and make association between epidemiological risk factors that...</p> <p><b>Line 187: I guess the author wanted to write 'randomly' and not 'ramdomly'. This is the second place this is appearing</b> All these errors have been corrected</p> <p><b>Line 193: Initials are not expected here.</b> All these have also been corrected</p> <p><b>Table 1: I suggest you use (%) instead of the footnote. Also for the positive column</b> All these have been corrected</p> <p><b>Line 277-280: I do not think this is necessary.</b> The authors agree and the word 'we' has been deleted</p> <p><b>Table 2: Why not use '(%)' instead of the footnote?</b> This has been done</p> <p><b>Line 390. Reference #9: If this is a book, the chapter title, editor(s) ... are missing</b> This has been corrected</p> <p><b>Line 392. Reference #10: This is not consistent with the other references</b> The authors agree and the reference is now cited properly</p>