



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2013_IJTDH_6019
Title of the Manuscript:	Current and future trends in the clinical diagnosis of Rickettsioses <i>lato sensu</i>
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors present a review of the literature on several human pathogens with an emphasis on diagnostics and present future prospects for improved diagnosis. While generally well written, there are numerous small grammatical errors throughout, many stemming from lack of help with English as a second language. See minor points for examples. The authors would benefit from the services of a professional editing service. As far as I am aware the Latin term “sensu lato” is not typically stated “lato sensu” as the authors have repeatedly used it throughout the manuscript. While researchers that study <i>Rickettsia</i>, <i>Anaplasma</i>, <i>Ehrlichia</i>, <i>Coxiella</i> and Bartonella often attend the same scientific conferences, and have similar research issues to contend with, it is not this reviewers opinion that anyone thinks of these genera as Rickettsia sensu lato. I think that if the author wants to combine all of these genera under the umbrella of one review, (s)he needs to find a different way to bring these topics together.	We have now revised the language and corrected the various small grammatical errors etc. We have changed the term to ‘sensu lato’ instead of ‘lato sensu’, in accordance with this and other reviewers’ request. These bacteria have remained together in this review, both because of the similar research issues and clinical symptoms or problems associated with diagnosis, but primarily because of historical reasons, which has also resulted in many reference laboratories to still consider these conditions together, as they were before the split. Thus, there remains an interest in



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Others have included these genera in the same document, but have not tried to push an archaic system. See http://pathmicro.med.sc.edu/mayer/rickettsia.htm. This review is devoid of any figures - a phylogenetic tree may be helpful to display the relatedness of various genera/species. Or one for each section (Rickettsiales, Bartonella and Coxiella). Several times the authors start sentences with “Bloggs et al (year) did experiment x...”, but they do not provide the reference number... because the reference list is not alphabetized, it is difficult to find these references. Additional structure would be helpful - for each set of pathogens the authors go through the same topics: characteristics of the organism, disease symptomology, diagnosis and treatment. Subheadings would be helpful.	reviewing these conditions together. No alterations have been made in the text with regards to this point, as this would also be in contrast to the other reviewers’ points. A phylogenetic tree could potentially be helpful to display the relatedness of the various genera/species, but this is pointless, given that the bacteria have now been re-classified into different phylogenetic trees. We have corrected this issue. Numbers were provided at the end of the paragraph, but we have now included them after the name and date, to avoid confusion. We feel that further fractionation of the text will result in loss of coherence and will result in fractionated text, rather than more structured. Also, this has not been in accordance with the other referee’s requests, so no further subheadings have been added.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It is best to refrain from referring to researchers by name as this is a subtle bias (you can't do it for everyone) - the author does this many times, Bloggs et al., did x, but also refers to Andy Hatch by name. Line 21: "placed Bartonella and Coxiella genus in the other taxonomic subdivisions" should read "placed the genera Bartonella and Coxiella in other taxonomic subdivisions" Line 50: "transitional" not "transicional" On line 47 the authors introduce the abbreviation SFG, but on lines 53, 56, 70 and 72 they use RSFG, and on line 67 SFR. Line 66: "in" should be "to" Line 71: delete "to" Lines 70-72: the authors state that epidemic typhus has high mortalities but rarely leads to death. Clarify. Line 84: "titter" should be "titer" - also be consistent with titer and titre. In lines 94-97 the authors describe genes used for rickettsial diagnosis, and then include an additional genes later on, 16S and htr (what is this?) - these should be described in the earlier section. Line 113 - new clinical pictures? Do you mean patients? Line 183 - "presented a 10 years"... nonsensical as stated... presented results from a 10 year study...	All the points identified by the reviewer in this section have been addressed in detail, and any additional points that have been identified in accordance with the referee's guidelines.
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	more words needed. Lines 188-193 - seems like this paragraph should be in the Rickettsia section as it doesn't shed light on Anaplasma/ehrlichia info. Line 213 - should be msp2 (not mps2) - also incorrect in refs. Lines 240-241: "...to adhere to mature erythrocytes, where occurs their intracellular replication" Restate... this makes it sound like they are doing intracellular replication while adhered to the outside of the erythrocyte. Lines 294-295: grEL should be GroEL. Gene names should be explained as to what they encode. Should also explain which gene the internal transcribed spacer comes from. Line 367: years. Line 369: shows. Lines 370-371: statement does not show increasing incidence. Line 379: correct grammar. Line 384: Add "been" before "fed" Line 391: delete the. Line 406 Delete s from respects. Line 599: "Biosensor technology hold a great promise" should read: "Biosensor technology holds great promise" Lines 658-659: clarify.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--