



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_43973
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening for Syphilis among Third Trimester Pregnant Women in a Low Resource Setting: A Missed Opportunity?
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>)

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	Prospective cross-sectional study involving 250 pregnant women with the aim to determine PREVALENCE, ASSOCIATED FACTORS and RELATIONSHIP WITH HIV of syphilis's infection among third trimester women in Bluea health District in Comeroon. Authors found: a prevalence of 6,4%; number of sex partners and high level of education as associated risk factors; no significant association with HIV. The design of the study is clear and simple and the paper is well written, however there are some problems that need to be addressed: - paragraph 2.1.3 SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATION can be removed (authors can just say that sample size was calculated) - line 81 anti-biotherapy? Antibiotic therapy? - line 82 authors should report the number of ethical approval by the local ethic committee - line 93-110 can be removed - line 116-118 can be removed - it will be interesting to report the questionnaire instead that say how the blood sample was taken or how to calculate the prevalence of syphilis - The RESULTS section is confused, there are too many tables and the content of text and tables is the same: remove some of the tables or some of the text. - line 138 add there was - line 141-143 remove and just say Table 1 summarizes... - line 151 write gestational age at enrolment (also in table 2) - line 215 authors say there was no significant association among those who were HIV positive and those who were HIV negative; however there was a statistically significant association between HIV and syphilis using the TPHA test. Authors should comment more this result in the discussion - authors should report a paragraph about the outcome of the pregnancies and neonatal outcome - in discussion authors should add a paragraph in which they discuss why they entitled the paper A MISSED OPPORTUNITY. In fact in the paper they report the	Dear Reviewer, thank you for the comment and suggestion about the need to include the term prospective in the study design. We carried out this study in a single phase which included recruiting our participants once and over a particular period (12 weeks) without a follow-up phase. So, we will love to maintain this study as a cross sectional hospital-based study. Sample size calculation: It is right to omit sample size calculations but in a such a rare study carried out in resource poor setting, in order to justify the credibility of our results we think it is important to let the scientific audience know how the sample size was obtained Line 93-110 stands to be the core scientific and clinical aspect of the study and makes it outstanding and distinct from Knowledge, Attitude and Practice studies. We belief that removing this part will handicap the evidence which justifies our conclusion. More so, the description on collection of blood samples and test for syphilis has been outlined on the data collection and procedure section and the prevalence of syphilis obtained through simple proportion from the results. Line 141-143 just gives a summary of what has been detailly presented on the table; with different categories of age groups, educational levels and occupation It is right to say gestational age at enrolment; however, this study was a cross sectional study and all participants received were enrolled at same time as study was conducted. There was no follow-up as such their gestational ages were collected once. Reviewer comment line 215: Please see line 259-261 for comment (not modified) Outcome of the pregnancies and neonatal outcome. -Thank you, reviewer, for that observation, our study was not designed associate exposure of disease to pregnancy outcome. It was cross sectional



SDI Review Form 1.6

	prevalence, associated factors and relationship of syphilis infection with HIV but from the data and the text it doesn't come to light why they consider third trimester a missed opportunity. - line 276 ETHICAL APPROVAL: give the reference number of the local ethic committee - check for typing errors, there are several.	study with no follow-up. Why MISSED OPPORTUNITY -see revised manuscript (LINE 269-279) -Line 276. Reference number of local ethic committee has been provided. - Typing errors verified Dear Reviewer, we are immensely grateful for your inputs. Accept our kind regards.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	