



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>The study is interesting and brings new data approaching the evaluation of latent TB patients but needs a serious major review.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract contains data for sex and age of patients and control that are not present in the methodology (lines 18 and 19). The authors should not show results before the methodology such as in lines 20, 21 and 22. These data should appear after.</p> <p>QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube assay acronym should appear at line 23, right after the expression in parenthesis, and not only at line 24.</p> <p>The conclusion of the abstract is not the same as in the text.</p> <p>Material and methods:</p> <p>It is not clear how the study group was enrolled. The patients and the healthy controls presented themselves at the Clinic? If the controls were healthy why they were investigate for TB?</p> <p>The authors don't explain if there was a clarifying explanation of the study to the patients and controls and why they did not sign a written consent.</p> <p>The authors do not describe the study group for sex and age. This information is present only at the abstract.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Shouldn't the analysis of the data between the QFT-GIT and <i>OnSite</i> TB rapid test be a correlation instead of a relation? The same comment is valid for the analysis of</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>blood grouping (ABO) and rhesus typing QFT-GIT and for the analysis of TST and QFT-GIT in extra-pulmonary TB patients.</p> <p>In Table 2 the authors refer that there was a highly significant result. Why this data is not shown at the results?</p> <p>The authors describe that there was a significant results for the analysis of blood grouping (ABO) and rhesus typing QFT-GIT. Between which groups?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Why do the authors conclude that Tb affects younger individuals? Where is this data in the results? (line 340)</p> <p>The authors should not repeat the results in the discussion (lines 348 – 356). They should compare and discuss further their results with those from other authors.</p> <p>The authors should review the text at lines 408 – 418. It is confused.</p> <p>Why is the conclusion from the abstract different from the text? The conclusion in the abstract reflects more the data from the study than the conclusion from the text. It seems that the conclusion from the text only repeats facts that are already known from the comparison of TST and QFT-GIT and the conclusion from the abstract is more relevant.</p> <p>Tables:</p> <p>All tables should be self-explanatory. The authors should add the meaning of all acronyms such as +ve and –ve. It is not clear in the tables which results are significant</p> <p>The authors should indicate which correlations were significant.</p> <p>General comment:</p> <p>The acronyms in the text should be reviewed. Some are not placed after the whole name and in other phrases the whole name is written again. If the acronym was cited</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	before there is no need to write the full name again.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The text should be reviewed for the written English.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors don't explain if there was a clarifying explanation of the study to the patients and controls and why they did not sign a written consent.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer