



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJMMR_7832
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube for TB Diagnosis with Reference to other Immunological Tests of Iraqi Patients
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: Local epidemiology of TB not mentioned. The prevalence of LTBI, active TB, rate of transmission, HIV infection and malnutrition.</p> <p>Methods: lacks clarity. The study design, is it retrospective or prospective study. Ethical issues not addressed. Interpretation of the laboratory results, standardization, operational definitions and The Gold standard of the diagnosis of LTBI not clear (Is there any LCA (Latent Class Analysis) method used or do you have the Gold standard?)</p> <p>Results: socio demographic data not mentioned at all except narratives. The tables lack clarity. It is difficult to do inferential statistics with this small sample size.</p> <p>Discussion: Not specific to your objective. It is difficult to link your findings with the discussion.</p> <p>Reference: Very good</p>	<p>New refs were added to introduction.</p> <p>Methods were revised. Please see the new revision.</p> <p>New table(1) was added from our of data to the result section which might makes socio demographic more clear.</p> <p>Discussion was revised too.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Lacks clarity. The methods, results and discussion section require major revision. Ethical issues not addressed. It is difficult to discuss scientifically with this primitive article. The article has important results, but needs to be revised.</p>	<p>Major revision was done.</p>