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Barriers to the effective treatment and prevention of malaria in Africa: A systematic review of qualitative studies

Thank you very much for your consideration of our article. We have reviewed the comments and revised our manuscript accordingly. Specifically, the changes made in response to the suggested minor revisions are in bold italics as follows:

1. While I can see that your quality assessment process may not have impacted in any way on your review's conclusions (either in terms of inclusion, or the weight given to particular studies), I think this process should be reported. A statement along the lines of "We assessed the included studies for their methodological quality using the CASP critical appraisal tool [add reference], but as this process did not affect either the studies we included, or the reliance we placed upon their findings, it is not reported in detail here."

We have added this statement on page 6, 2nd full paragraph, with the appropriate reference.

For a representative sample of articles, we also extracted data on study methodology and assessed quality by means of the CASP critical appraisal tool [11]. As the outcome of this appraisal did not affect our study inclusion criteria, or
the weighting of their findings in our analysis, the results are not reported in detail here.

2. I think you have overlooked item 10 in my original review. I think it's important to place reviews in the context of others in the same field. If there aren't any other reviews (and I guess you'll have found them, if there are any!), then I think this is a strong justification for the existence of your review, and a critical claim for its significance in the field. A sentence to this effect could be added after "Accounting for these should enhance the efficacy and scope of malaria control programs."

We have referred to a previous review and how ours differs from this review in page 4, 1st full paragraph:

An excellent review of qualitative studies done between 1996 and 2000 explored qualitative data "pertaining to the home management of illness episodes of malaria in sub-Saharan Africa" [9].

The data and references have been verified, and the manuscript’s formatting revised to conform to the guidelines provided by BMC.

With thanks,

The authors