



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>)

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	Abstract 1. There is significant need for editing especially to remove or insert space between words all through the manuscript (check the manuscript or suggestions). 2. Mean values are missing 3. Predictive values of ascetic protein and cholesterol should have been stated to ensure comparison. 4. I doubt if these conclusions are justifiable considering that the sensitivity and specificity are not so high. Besides nothing in the study suggests that sensitivity would increase when combined with cytology.	I have edited the work I have added the mean values I have included it in the abstract I have included the fact that cholesterol could supplement cytology



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Background 1. What is the basis of interest in ascetic protein? Patients and Methods 1. Why is this heading repeated in line 80? 2. I would suggest that lines 81 to 85 precede the description of the tests. 3. What is the meaning of 'samples of various blood' (line 65)? 4. What does line 73 mean? 5. How many participants were in group 2? 28 or 38? (line 91) 6. Lines 93 to 98 are results why are they being stated under methods? Results 1. Was the difference in the mean age of the two groups significant? What is the p value? 2. What is the specificity of ascitic protein? 62.7 Or 37.8 (abstract vs. line 142)? 3. Are you sure there is no significant difference between the mean protein values for the two groups? I think there is (p=0.0291)- line 145. Tables 1. The tables are poorly illustrated with no labels. 2. Tables 1 and 2 are not quite lucid. 3. Table 3 is misleading as the values are totally different for what is in the abstract and text. 4. If sensitivity and specificity are 60 and 70 respectively, how come accuracy is 85? 5. What was the cut of for ascetic cholesterol? 64 or 72.7 (line 160 vs. Table 3) 6. Table 4 does not show the mean ascitic cholesterol levels. Hence line 201 under discussion cannot be derivable from this write up. 7. I suggest that you include the contingency tables from	Just looking for a simple biomarker I have deleted it Agreed and changed to fit the reviewer's comment Various samples of blood I meant protein kit(i corrected it) 38 I have removed to results section Noted and corrected in the final article. I have added the labels and corrected the tables Noted and corrected 72.7 All quoted statistical values are corrected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	which sensitivity, specificity etc. Were derived. Conclusion 1. Are there any conclusions or even limitations from this study? 2. Authors are advised to view the Journal's author instruction as a guide to improving the quality of the Manuscript.	Conclusions have been added in the final corrected work noted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic is of interest but the Manuscript requires an overhaul in order to be publishable.	Noted and corrected