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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for your extensive edits to the paper. It is improved and easier to follow. I have a few comments which I suggest should be addressed prior to publication.

PREVIOUS COMMENT:
Line 36: I don’t think there is good evidence on the use of malaria RDTs in reducing malaria mortality in most parts of the world. Certainly they offer potential, but it is my understanding that this has not yet been achieved.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE:
The respective sentence has been reworded (see revised manuscript, lines 33-35).

REVIEWERS' RESPONSE
The sentence remains in the past tense, which states that RDTs have contributed to reduced malaria morbidity and mortality in most parts of the world. I am not aware of evidence to show that RDTs have already had such a large effect, but they do offer potential (as you explain in the background).

PREVIOUS COMMENT
Lines 226-229: Please check the explanation – are you saying that both 19.0% and 72.7% of patients that were found the test useful? I find the current explanation quite confusing.

RESPONSE:
In the multiple choice questions, patients who were in favour of an RDT found it useful (only 19.0%), but most found it a useful tool for malaria diagnosis (83.3%) (Fisher’s exact test, p <0.001). When considering utility, 85.1% of patients rejecting an RDT found it of no utility (#2 = 30.39, p <0.001) (see revised manuscript, lines 228-231).

REVIEWER'S RESPONSE
Thanks for the edits, but I still find this confusing. Perhaps it would be helpful for the editors of the journal could take a look at this prior to publication.
REVIEWER’S COMMENT
Presentation of Table 4 could be improved. e.g. distinguish variable from categories, and check categories are meaningful (e.g. should “know status” be replaced by “know HIV status” and VIH with HIV). Also I find it confusing to have variables listed with no ORs reported.

COMMENTS FROM REVIEWER ON LANGUAGE:
• The terms “a malaria RDTs” and “a RDTs” confuse singular and plural terms: it is better to write either “a malaria RDT” (singular) or “malaria RDTs” (plural).
• Line 290: I suggest replacing “unfavourable to an RDTs for malaria” with “unwilling to have an RDT test for malaria”
• Tables 2 and 3: please could you update “Favourable” and “Unfavourable” to the revised headings used in Table 1? From what you have explained, the terms willing and unwilling are more accurate and meaningful.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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