



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12875
Title of the Manuscript:	Thrombocytopenia in Egyptian patients with Hepatitis C Virus Treated with Standard of Care Therapy: A Cohort Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Methodologically, the comparison group is significantly different at baseline which means that they should not be used as such. A better comparison would be those individuals who were eligible for treatment but did not receive standard care. I do understand your limitation in overall N, but group II does not contribute to the findings. Please review current literature on thrombocytopenia and hepatitis C, the findings of the study may be dated for several reasons: 1. Over 80% of your references are 5 or more years old. 2. Much of the newer research covers additional therapies such as boceprevir and telaprevir. For the future, I would be very interested to see similar data as you have shown compared with the triple therapies now on the market and how the laboratory data compare.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Throughout the manuscript please identify the acronyms and their definitions prior to using them; there are multiple acronyms that were not spelled out initially or in the wrong place, such as: ERV vs. EVR; CLD; RBV; and TPO. Additionally, using “-ve” and “+ve” is acceptable but you should identify it in the beginning.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall the manuscript is well written. It has some minor grammatical issues that need to be addressed. The study evaluated chronic hepatitis C patients' thrombocytopenia levels and the effect standard treatment (interferon and ribavirin) had on those levels. The findings of the study strengthen the overall body of literature by reiterating current knowledge; however the methodology and dated references are an issue.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Institute for Science and Education, USA