Reviewer’s report

Title: Pregnancy-specific malarial immunity and risk of malaria in pregnancy and adverse birth outcomes: a systematic review

Version: 1 Date: 20 Oct 2019

Reviewer: Diane Taylor

Reviewer's report:

The authors have made significant changes in the manuscript and it is now easier to follow the overall flow of the analysis. Deleting/moving the sections on anemia (multiple causes), severe malaria (no standard definition) and premature delivery (multiple causes, inaccurate timing) helps focus the goals of the analysis and provides clarity. Adding summary sentences really helped me understand how to interpret what I had just read. I would have loved to see the last sentence in the first paragraph of the Discussion in the Abstract, as the conclusions in the Abstract (i.e., we need more studies) seems weak.

Two minor points:

1. Rapid Diagnostic Tests (RDTs): RDTs are not mentioned in the section on diagnose of malaria. Did any of the studies included in the study use RDT? I assume that if RDTs were used, the authors also used histology or blood smears. But it is possible that some of the studies use RDT without additional parasitological support. Some mention of RDTs seems relevant.

2. Both Lloyd et al. (2018) and Siriwardhana et al. (2017) used samples from 1377 pregnant women. (I hate numbers as they are impossible to proofread. Sorry for the confusion).
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