



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17322
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE SERUM LIVER ENZYMES MARKERS, LIPID PROFILE AND KIDNEY FUNCTION PARAMETERS IN TYPHOID PATIENTS
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A very good and thorough job, well written and structured. However, needs small corrections in English. Abstract ok. Introduction is too short. References are not current and poor amount. Correct this point. Please present more details about CREATININE AND POTASSIUM ION CONCENTRATION IN TEST AND CONTROL GROUP. Present the main result in the conclusion. The main focus of this study was not discussed.	We acknowledge the comment of the reviewer. We also have corrected the English mistakes made, this was due to the version of Microsoft used for the preparation of the manuscript, if opened in a lower version would join words together, but we have fixed and resolved that. For the introduction, we had a lot to write introducing the disease, but we summarized it and made it very simple, however, we added little on means of detection of the causative organism, which was lacking in the previous introduction. We have improved the discussion to bear the main focus of the work. Also we have included a summary of the main result in the conclusion as suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		