



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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is an interesting study that explores the utility of the IGRAs in conjunction with the rapid IgM/IgG tests for TB. However, the presentation of the facts can be improved upon to send across a clear message with no ambiguities.</p> <p>The import of this research is marred by the imprecise phrases and grammatical errors which are highlighted under minor revision.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The topic needs to be rephrased as it does not capture the essence of this study. I suggest the topic should run along these lines: An evaluation of QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube and immunological tests for TB diagnosis in Iraqi patients</p> <p>The conclusion paragraph in the abstract needs to be rephrased. I don't think the most important finding in this study was the significant reduction in proportion of referred individuals as stated by the authors. Instead, the study highlighted the sensitivity of IGRAs for diagnosis of active TB in combination with the rapid IgM/IgG tests for TB. Unfortunately, the TST was not run concurrently; it would have been nice to do a comparison between the IGRA and TST.</p> <p>The association with blood groups and vaccination is also significant.</p> <p>Was this study aimed at identifying latent TB patients or those with active disease? It appears that the initial background given was towards identification of latent TB. However, the discussion focussed more on active disease. Authors should decide on the dominant theme and stick to it for uniformity.</p>	<p>The title of the paper is changed as suggested by the reviewer.</p> <p>Conclusion is revised as well. The sentence concluded by the reviewer was inserted in the conclusion .</p> <p>Corrections suggested by the reviewer are considered too.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The authors stated the common age group that was affected. However, the age and gender distribution was not made available to readers.</p>	<p>New table covering your suggestion is added as a part already in this project. We selected some data of the protocol that we thought is enough for the paper concerned (table 1) in new revised MS..</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The following errors should be corrected:</p> <p>Line 16: association – should read “associations”</p> <p>Line 17: blood group – should read “blood groups”</p> <p>Line 19: range – should read “ranged”</p> <p>Kindly rephrase line 21 and line 22.</p> <p>Line 27: contact that was – should read “contact that were”</p> <p>Line 28: should read: QFT assay appeared to be a more...</p> <p>Line 40: which is (delete)</p> <p>Line 48: the MTB complex organisms are more than the 3 stated. Please add M. microti, M. canettii, M. pinnipedii, M. caprae.</p> <p>Line 64: add “a” : in a 2012 report</p> <p>Line 80: remove brackets from “extra-pulmonary TB.”</p> <p>The subsequent sentences should read: The most common target is the lungs called pulmonary TB. The TB....</p> <p>Line 139: CDC is being used for the first time; kindly state the full meaning.</p> <p>Line 184: CDC can now be abbreviated.</p> <p>Line 248: add full stop ie “ instructions. Tests.....</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 289: Rephrase “According to sex....”</p> <p>Line 291: Rephrase “According to residence...”</p> <p>213: Change V to upper case: Vaccination</p> <p>Line 298: Insert “the”: Found in the vaccinated.</p> <p>Line 409: Rephrase: “high costs of price of tests....”</p> <p>Line 416: Delete: Trajman et al. who concluded</p> <p>Line 425: Add “s” : Class of immunological tests</p> <p>Line 273: Delete: Computerized statistically analysis.</p> <p>Kindly remove spaces in the following references: 9,12,13,16,21.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		