



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	

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Serious Major revision required Title: The title of this manuscript did not wholesomely reflect the stated aim (line 12) of this manuscript. Abstract Study design: authors should indicate the type of study they carried out. They should also indicate the place and duration of study. Methodology: ➤ Authors should state the methods used in estimating cholesterol and protein concentrations and the technique used in cytology. ➤ The type of analysis carried out and the level of significance should also be incorporated here. Introduction Lines 8-10: should be brought to the introduction. Material and Methods Line 80, a duplication of line 61, should be removed completely. Lines 81-92 should be inserted above line 62. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria for selecting the patients?	Many corrections and changes have been added to this article Cross sectional study The principle is included in the final submitted work \ Noted and included I have done so I have removed it Noted I have included them



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 91: “ascites) and Group II (made up of 28 patients in made up of those with...”. Authors should re-write the above sentence for more clarity. Lines 106-108: Cytology involved the usual steps of tissue processing as sample collected (in this case ascitic fluid), was rolled over the slide and the smear fixed immediately. This is not the standard method for making smears using fluids/samples from serous cavities or exfoliating surfaces. This part should be re-written. Lines 109-111: “The sample collected may also be air-dried, fixed in methanol and stained by using the modifications of May-graunwald stain”. This part should be removed entirely; this is not a practical session. Authors should only state what they did. Since much emphasis was placed on cytology, author(s) should present micrographs of stained typical malignant slide and non-malignant slides from this study. Line 135: “The highest tribe was represented by the was Yoruba (75%)”. This sentence should be rephrased. What is the relationship between tribes’ lifestyle and ascites in Nigeria? Were they predisposed to ascites due to their location or profession? Results: “Tables and figures should be presented as per their appearance in the text. It is suggested that the discussion	It has been corrected Noted and removed I have rephrased it No known standard relationship
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures. No tables or figures should be given without discussion or reference inside the text”. Tables should be numbered in Arabic numerals. The tables in this manuscript lack headings and footnotes. Authors should insert appropriate headings and footnotes. Table 1 and 4 should be completed as they seem to be lacking some vital information. Authors did not state clearly if it was <u>total</u> protein that they measured. What was the Serum Ascitic Cholesterol Gradient (SACG) in both groups? Was there any correlation between body mass index and each of the assayed parameters? Did the authors find any correlation between the patients’ profession and the assayed parameters? Conclusion The authors did not conclude their study after discussing the findings. Acknowledgements The authors did not acknowledge any co-worker or colleague who may have offered technical assistance. Competing interest	\Noted Noted It has been completed and included Total protein was measured Another paper on SACG is on the way-I wrote extensively on SACG in both groups No correlation noted No correlation found Conclusions are included in the final manuscript sent Acknowledgement is added No competing interest
--	--	--

	The authors made no statement declaring if there were competing interests or not. Authors should state their individual contributions. Authors may use the following wordings for this section: “ ‘Author A’ designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. ‘Author B’ and ‘Author C’ managed the analyses of the study. ‘Author C’ managed the literature searches..... All authors read and approved the final manuscript.” SDI (2003) Ethical approval Lines 86-89, “ethical approval was given by the Health Research and Ethics Committee of the Lagos University Teaching Hospital. Signed informed consents were obtained from the patients.”, should be given a subheading (Ethical approval). According to SDI (2003), For manuscripts involving human experiments, Authors may use the following wordings for this section: “All authors hereby declare that all experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki.” <u>References</u> ➤ There are no recent citations in the reference sections. All journals should be abbreviated and without punctuation marks. Journal name abbreviations should be those found in the NCBI databases (Link: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals). ➤ Authors used different styles of referencing	I have done so Noted I have included recent journal
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	instead of sticking to the traditional American Medical Association (AMA) style of referencing used by ScienceDomain International. ➤ Journal names should not be italicized.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 56: "The present study was ~~performed~~ carried out to....." Lines 74-79 should be removed completely or summarized into a line. Values and their units should not be written together as in ~~34.41±16.67g/l and 71.5±7.35g/l~~ but separated this way 34.41±16.67 g/l and 71.5±7.35 g/l. Lines 204-205: Prieto et al reported ~~an a~~ mean ~~asciticfluid~~ ascetic fluid cholesterol.	I have corrected this section I left it because another reviewer r wants all the principles included I have corrected these errors noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript was not properly organized, hence the lack of cohesion between the points. There are some inconsistencies in the manuscript. Authors should study the SDI template for manuscript preparation and organize their manuscript accordingly. Authors should re-write the Title, Abstract and result sections of this manuscript.	Noted and corrected