



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_21756
Title of the Manuscript:	"Screening of Suspected HIV-AIDS Patients: A Comparative Study Evaluating HIV-ICT Device and ELISA"
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the Abstract section, on lines 19 and 20 are 21 cases HIV positive with ICT device and 85 negative samples, aren't they? 2. Western blot is more sensitive than ELISA, but is a complementary test, PCR is a confirmatory test. The authors validated rapid screening test with ELISA, is valid because it is the gold standard for screening tests, but gold standard diagnosis is PCR. Authors should mention this in the text. 3. Update references to 2013-2015. 	<p>1-We have corrected the said lines, as it was a typing mistake, previously.</p> <p>2-We have mentioned the diagnostic capability of the discussed assays accordingly.</p> <p>3-Few recent most references of the articles have been quoted.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		