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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript by Lehane and colleagues looked at geomean parasite density, msp2 and MS genotyping in paired venous and capillary samples. The paper was well written.

The x axis for figure 3 is the same as figure 4. Also the range of 2.5 to 15% does not make sense to encapsulate all the parasitemias.

Another small point is the MSP2 diversity as a function of venous parasite density.

Is the greater diversity more apparent at higher parasite densities-say the range of 1-1,000, 1,000 to 10,000 and 10,000 to max

The paper relied on blood smear for parasite density. Why not verify with semiquantitative PCR or taq man which would also relate relative amounts of WBC counted.

Also how much of the DBS was processed for DNA extraction and what percent was input into PCR.

IE what was microL equivalents of input into PCR.

Minor italics for genus species in reference

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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