

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_107346
Title of the Manuscript:	Serological evaluation of a cohort of patients with chronic Chagas disease treated with benznidazole in a low endemic area of Central Brazil
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. No. I suggest the following changes: 1) include a correlation between the data obtained by IIM and ELISA with follow up time; 2) Give the mean or the media follow up of the study; 3) Change the conclusion: These findings.....SUGGEST that decreased antibody levels MAY be associated with parasitological cure in patients with chronic Chagas disease</p> <p>4. No. Methods. The Mann-Whitney test is not used for correlations; use the Spearman test instead. Results: Please, give the mean or median of the data related to follow up time. Discussion: 1) the discussion section is too long, and it needs to be shortened accordingly; 2) "Through the mosquito vector": change to bug or insect, because you are not dealing with a mosquito; 3) page 10, line 13: most patients.....durations. It is not true. Actually, only IMM and ELISA had reduced antibody times in the follow up; 4) page 11, line 5: Therefore.....efficacy. It is not true; it is a hypothesis. Please, rewrite the phrase. References: correct the authors' name of reference number 24 (Dias, not Days). Tables: give mean or median of data; Figure 1: Remove B and C: leave only A and D if there was correlation between data</p> <p>5. Yes, with the caveats above</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reinaldo B. Bestetti
Department, University & Country	University of Ribeirão Preto, Brazil