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Reviewer’s report:

Effectiveness of two antifolates prophylactic strategies against malaria in HIV positive pregnant women in Bangui, Central African Republic (MACOMBA study protocol): a randomized open label control trial

I. Previous comments adequately attended to?

All the previous comments have been adequately responded to; including the typos and language revisions. However, in the process of language corrections a few omissions/inclusions have been noted that will require minor attention e.g.:

1.1 Under the title “Abstract”, within the background information; the sentence starting with the aim of this study is to compare … has ‘a’ before recommended which could read better if the ‘a’ is perhaps removed in order to read: The aim of this study is to compare the effectiveness of SP-IPT, which is recommended for the prevention …

1.2 Under the title “Relevance”, the fifth paragraph starting with the statement: The emergence of an increase is missing ‘in the’ before frequency of resistance of P. falciparum to SP. This statement would then read: The emergence of an increase in the frequency of resistance …

1.3 Under the title “Hypothesis” on page 8, as well as “Study design” SP-IPT is written SP-ITP. These will require correction.

1.4 Under “Participants” on page 9, the second sentence is written: All pregnant women attending one of the maternity clinics will be offered…This statement could perhaps be rephrased to include ‘either’ instead of ‘one’ as I believe all pregnant women from all the clinics will be offered an HIV test?

1.5 On page 9 under “Recruitment and randomization”, the second sentence is seems to be missing ‘group’ at the end? In order to read ….randomly allocated to either SP-IPT or co-trimoxazole group?

1.6 On page 10, the second paragraph (within the insertion), and the statement which begins: Once a pregnant woman … has the latter part of the statement written ‘and the She staff will assign’…, ‘She’ was meant to be ‘site’?
1.7 On page 10 under study drugs SP-IPT is written SP-ITP (a small correction at this point as well please).

1.8 On page 11 the second paragraph on the quinine dosing, perhaps it will be better to fully qualify the statement by adding 24mg/kg body weight will be given at three doses per day ‘8 hourly’ apart for 7 days.

1.9 On page 15, the statement which starts: A logistic regression model …‘of’ is missing between ‘the number and placental malaria infections’ to complete the sentence.

1.10 Under “Discussion” on page 15, perhaps it will be better to replace the word ‘should’ with ‘may’ at the beginning of the 4th sentence so that it reads ‘It may result in better’… rather than It ‘should’ result in better …?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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