



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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Line 17 title of article does not match with this test</p> <p>61 ref needed</p> <p>202 define susp cases of tb.were they pul or extrapulm</p> <p>Tb needs to be confirmed with some direct method</p> <p>Define controls because by qft 1 control was positive</p> <p>300 reframe sentence</p> <p>301 details of rapid tb test as WHO has recommended</p> <p>cessation of usage of tb elisa</p> <p>316 why bldg ping has been clubbed with qft?</p> <p>341 tb mainly affects young biased study gp so cant give a gen conclusion</p> <p>363 treatment of which tb?pul/extrapul/latent?</p> <p>369 no significant association with qft and vaccination.This contradicts the use of qft mentioned in introduction</p> <p>The conclusions do not matchthe desired aims of the study</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer