SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_IJTDH_6568**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Strongyloides hyperinfection in renal transplant - diagnosis by endoscopic intestinal biopsy**
Type of the Article	**Case Study**

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	This is an interesting case report article about the Strongyloides stercoralis hyperinfection in renal transplant patients that diagnosed by endoscopic intestinal biopsy. Strongyloides stercoralis is an intestinal nematode that the infection of this parasite is very important special in immunodeficiency patients and people that who used immunosuppressive drugs.	Thank you
Minor REVISION comments	This paper is written in good English but have limited problem that should be reformed before publication. 1. Why the authors don't use of Baerman or Harada mori methods for detection of Strongyloides stercoralis larva in stool and used endoscopy only after routine stool examination? 2. Do the authors use endoscopy or sensitive parasitological methods for follow up the infection and conformation of efficacy for Ivermectin. 3. In page 3, line 77, the reference should be added after "effect". 4. In page 3, line 83, the word of "cysts" should be eliminated, because the text and details is related to Strongyloides stercoralis.	1. Earlier in our institute only routine stool examination was followed. After this experience, we added the concentration methods. 2. We have not done the follow-up endoscopy after procedure. 3. Reference added as advised and reference numbers were changed accordingly both in text and reference section also. 4. Cysts word was removed
Optional/General comments	However, this is suitable and good article for publication in this journal after minor revision. I hope my suggestions are helpful to you.	