



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

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

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Introduction is too long: in particular, lines 34-91 do not seem relevant to the study. On the other hand, data on Onsite Tb IgG/IgM should be provided in this section</li> <li>2) Methods: As repeatedly stated by the authors IGRAs represent an aid in diagnosing Tb infection; however, IGRAs do not distinguish from latent and active Tb. How was active Tb diagnosed? Was any distinction made between active Tb and latent Tb patients?</li> <li>3) Methods: there is no reference to ABO and/or Rh testing in this section</li> <li>4) Results: lines 285-286. What does "highest positive" refer to? Number of patients positive for QFT-GIT, Onsite TB, PPD? All 3? Please state clearly.</li> <li>5) Results: A demographic table (i.e. age, sex etc) indicating the characteristics of the patients enrolled together with the percentage of positive QFT-GIT/PPD/ Onsite Tb igG/IgM may help interpret the first lines of the results section.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Introduction was condensed as required.</li> <li>2.answered in new version.</li> <li>3.ABO ref. Was made.</li> <li>4.answered.</li> <li>5.The table was inserted in the new version as we had already this made in our pool of data recorded.See table 1 please.</li> </ol>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Line 179: QFT-GIT is an abbreviation used for the first time in the text, please correct</li> <li>2) Line 243: indicate how many months was plasma stored for</li> <li>3) Table 2 has an overstating caption (diagnostic significance of QFT-GIT)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Done.</li> <li>2.answered.</li> <li>3.Corrected.</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	The manuscript is difficult to understand in some parts. It should be reviewed by a native English language speaker.	Major revision including English was made. Please see new version.