



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17884
Title of the Manuscript:	The Predictive Diagnostic and Prognostic Cut-off Values for Interleukin 8 in Patients with Meningitis in Egypt
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	As you know determination of interleukin 8 in CSF is not a substitute for classical CSF analysis. Its sensitivity as you stated in your research is low(50 %)We know that IL 8 is associated with increased vascular permeability with high turbidity, increased protein and WBC in CSF. Sepsis is also associated with increased permeability of vascular endothelium. When we see high IL 8 levels, classical CSF laboratory findings support or discriminate septic bacterial meningitis so there may be no added value in determining IL 8 in this situations. In a small sample size to reach a conclusion about the prognostic value of IL 8 is early.	Thank you very much for your valuable comments. We agree with you that our small sample size cannot reach a conclusion about the prognostic value, and we admitted in our discussion and recommended to be repeated on large sample size. But as regards the diagnostic value, we still in our practice find a cases which are difficult to be classified as septic or aseptic, so IL-8 in this situations can be considered as adding value and not substitution for the routine CSF exam especially with the non-convincing sensitivity. But we considered specificity of 82.35% to be a good reflection for the true negative rates.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Change all words (as regard to as regards) please.	These were corrected and highlighted in yellow. Thank you
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		