

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Thu, Jan 16, 2014 at 3:36 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Request for final decision for manuscript # IJTDH_7761

Please review just a few pages.
You can clearly see the name of commercial product.
Please visit the website of **OraQuick**.

The study involved children aged less than 18 months referred for screening in two large HIV care programmes in Nigeria using **OraQuick** (Test A) and **Determine** (Test B). The testing was blinded and HIV status was confirmed using DNA PCR.

OraQuick and the results were compared with an enzyme immunoassay [5]. A test sensitivity of 100% was obtained with **OraQuick**. In another study carried out to validate the performance of rapid tests in 5 clinical trial sites in Africa and one site in the United States, **OraQuick** and **Determine** had overall sensitivities of 99.3% and 99.8% and specificities of 99.3% and 99.4% respectively [6]. In the United States, there were concerns about the performance of oral fluid-based **OraQuick** test as a result of

Editor's Details:

Tetsuji Yamada

Chair and Professor of Health Economics, Center for Children and Childhood Studies
Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, USA

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id and some comments, which are against the SDI peer review guidelines.