



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16624
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Rheumatoid Factors and Bilirubin on the Sensitivity of Immunochromatographic Rapid Diagnostic Tests for HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis B in Cameroon.
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 (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	The paper is well written but requires major revision. The paper sought to present evidence of effect of Rheumatoid Factor (RF) and bilirubin on sensitivity and other diagnostic characteristics of rapid diagnostic tests for HIV and HBV compared with high sensitivity ELISA test as reference. However, results were provided for only the viral tests excluding the RF and bilirubin levels. In spite of this, attempts have been made to present information suggestive of lack of effects of those factors on the RDT. This is quite problematic as the data provided failed to support that line of argument. The specific comments have been made on the paper and I hope that authors would be given opportunity to address them appropriately. Despite the well-written nature of the paper, I reject it in its current state. My overall score is 4.5/10. This is because, as already indicated, additional data need to be provided with appropriate statistical analysis of the data. Specifically, the author(s) must address why they chose 2-factor ANOVA instead of other appropriate tests to study effect of variables. Specific comments have been duly made on the actual paper. The data as presented does not warrant that test. That test may be appropriate depending on the additional data that would be provided. If these issues get addressed satisfactorily, the paper must be reconsidered for acceptance and publication.	We agree with reviewer that it was an oversight to leave out the results for RF. We have provided data on RF and bilirubin before examining the influence of these parameters on the RDTs. Also in agreement with the Reviewer, for an appropriate statistical analysis of the data, we have used a 1-factor ANOVA test to find the effect of RF and Bilirubin on RDT.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		