



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_12611
Title of the Manuscript:	USEFULNESS OF ASCITIC FLUID CHOLESTEROL AND PROTEIN IN THE DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS OF ASCITES IN NIGERIA: COMPARISM WITH CONVENTIONAL CYTOLOGY.
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

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	1. The paper is novel because it intends to introduce a biomarker for the detection of malignant ascites. However, I fill the title should be modified to "Comparism of Ascitic fluid Total Cholesterol and Total protein with conventional cytology in the Differential diagnosis of ascites" 2. Line 18 &19 has no mean value of cholesterol while line 20 has no mean value for protein. 3. There is no inclusion and exclusion criteria 4. The patients and methods should be rename Materials and Methods and divided into i. Study Area ii. Collection of Samples iii. Laboratory Analysis 5. Line 73 should read protein kit while line 79 should cite a reference. 6. Line 100 should give the principle of cholesterol and cite a reference 7. Line 105 should contain a reference 8. Line 110 should be modified as well as lie111 9. Line 140 should be farmers and not formers 10. Table 1 is incomplete 11. Line 153 should be diagnostic value not diagnosis value 12. Line 156 should be table 111 not table11 13. Line 159 which tables 14. Table iv is incomplete	The topic may be changed to rhyme with what the reviewer wrote. However, I think both topics are saying same thing . I have included the mean values in the manuscript I have included them I have subdivided into these 3sections Corrected it Principle included Corrected Completed table inserted Corrected it Corrected it Completed it

	15. Fig 1 should be deleted because not necessary to this work. 16. The discussion should be articulate and robust to drive home the point. 17. Reference should be cited in line 198,202,204(Example Prieto <i>et al</i> ¹) 18. There is not conclusion highlighten the major findings of this work. 19. The references should be checked. et al is not accepted. All names of authors should be written. 20. Journal names should either be in full or abbreviated not both.	Noted and corrected I have added the conclusion Correction noted noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		