



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International STD Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_I-SRR_14352
Title of the Manuscript:	Chlamydial Proctitis in patients with Chlamydial Cervicitis
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I have some observations and I hope to contribute to the improvement of this report.</p> <p>In the abstract:</p> <p>Line 10: It's not clear which patients were submitted to a colonoscopy, and you checked for retal lesions those with positive rectal mucosal TMA.</p> <p>Line 11: How many days after treatment did you take a new sample or colonoscopy??</p> <p>In body text:</p> <p>Introduction: I expected more comments about symptomatology of proctitis and another causes either. I think you could have written about clinical characteristics of the disease and the frequency because you had asked to the patients.</p> <p>In the body text, lines 47, 48 and 49, seems to be the aim of the search. But it is different from what is written in lines 6, 7 and 8 in the abstract. It's necessary to clear this up.</p> <p>The sentence in lines 66-67 needs to be revised, because the statistical analysis is for the dates not the patients.</p> <p>Finally, I didn't see the conclusions at the end of the discussion, and I don't agree with the way that is written in the abstract (lines 18-21). In there, the first sentence is a result not a conclusion (what should be), and the other is not in accordance with what you had written previously in the aim of the search (lines 6-8).</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	If there any ethical issue, please clarify.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I'd like to congratulate the authors because of the research. It's an interesting theme, very important for clinicians and gynaecologists. I liked the discussion and I think this research is consistent and good for reading. These are some suggestions that you should consider and discuss about referred changes.</p> <p>I suggest two papers to be included in the references:</p> <p>1- Dukers-Muijers NHTM, Speksnijder AGCL, Morre« SA, Wolffs PFG, van der Sande MAB, et al. (2013) Detection of Anorectal and Cervicovaginal Chlamydia Trachomatis Infections following Azithromycin Treatment: Prospective Cohort Study with Multiple Time-Sequential Measures of rRNA, DNA, Quantitative Load and Symptoms. PLoS ONE 8(11): e81236. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081236</p> <p>2- Dukers-Muijers NHTM, Morre« SA, Speksnijder A, van der Sande MAB, Hoebe CJPA (2012) Chlamydia trachomatis Test-of-Cure Cannot Be Based on a Single Highly Sensitive Laboratory Test Taken at Least 3 Weeks after Treatment. PLoS ONE 7(3): e34108. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0034108</p> <p>I think these recent articles would be useful for the discussion and conclusions.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brazil</b>