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Reviewer’s report:

This was an interesting and welcome evaluation of existing National guidelines (from selected countries) on malaria prevention in travelers. The guidelines were assessed according to Agree II tool, that is an internationally accepted standard for reporting assessment of guidelines. The results were interesting, especially because they outline the lack of uniformity among the different guidelines on many aspects. The discussion and conclusions are adequately supported by the data presented and are sufficiently concise and balanced. The purpose of the evaluation was clearly stated and the methods used were sufficiently sound (see above). The writing is appropriate.

I have nevertheless a few remarks:

1. The authors do not acknowledge any limitation of their research, nevertheless there are some in my opinion (see below) that should be at least acknowledged, if it is not possible to correct them.

2. The authors do not specify when was the literature search carried out, therefore it would not be possible to check if they might have missed one or more document. In fact, there is only a document dated 2013, all others are older.

3. The search strategy was wide but not exhaustive as regards the databases searched, therefore this choice should be explained and justified.

4. Limiting to English language is understandable, but it is clear that this leaves out guidelines issued by important countries (with millions of travelers), especially from Europe, that might have important differences in key recommendations from those of English speaking bodies.

5. As an example, new Italian guidelines have appeared in 2013, moreover an extended summary in English have been formally published, so the reason for excluding them from the evaluation might be that they were published after the review had been carried out (see point 2), or any other.

I am not requiring the authors to fill all the above mentioned gaps, but I am asking them to provide the necessary answers and to acknowledge these limitations in the manuscript.
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