Reviewer 2: Sam L Nsobya

The study was about screening known single nucleotide polymorphisms mediating resistance in \textit{pf}dhfr, \textit{pf}dhps and \textit{k}13 genes from the clinical samples collected from Eritrea health facilities.

Comments:

1. The objective was not smart and study poorly designed

   \textbf{Reply 1: Thank you for your feedback. The objectives of the study have been reviewed and included in the introduction.}

2. The sample size was inadequate i.e only 19 samples analyzed and out of those 42\% samples did not generate results and no reason was given. It is also not explained: why after consent, 19 dried blood spot (DBS) samples were successfully collected from a total of 131 patients who visited the three hospitals during the study period.

   \textbf{Reply 2: Thank you for your feedback. This has been reviewed in the methods of the study}

3. The inclusion criteria: blood samples were obtained from patients with febrile illness. No screening using microscopy or rapid diagnostic test.

   \textbf{Reply 3: Thank you for your feedback. This has been reviewed in the methods of the study}

4. Methodology section was poorly written

   \textbf{Reply 4: Thank you for your feedback. The methodology has been reviewed}

5. Statistical and bioinformatics poorly analyzed and written

   \textbf{Reply 5: Thank you for your feedback. The methodology and results have been reviewed}

6. The conclusion does not reflect the data generated and the write up is ambiguous i.e statement like \textit{Pfdhfr} C59R and \textit{Pfdhps} K540E are reliable markers for the quintuple mutant haplotype conferring full resistance to SP.

   \textbf{Reply 6: Thank you for your feedback. The abstract and write-up have been reviewed.}

My conclusion: This article is not worthy of indexing because the way it was designed and written.