



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13282
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating prevalence rate of HCV, HBV, and HIV co-infection in Khorramabad, iran, in 2013
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(<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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Although HIV prevalence studies are not considered as high priority in the field, I think finding a better knowledge about co-infection rates besides prevalence study is of utmost importance to surveillance and treatment programs in Iran. Considering the high concentration of resources in certain capital cities of the country, some important issues may be overlooked during time and studies like the present one can provide valuable information. The manuscript will benefit from a major English language revision by a native speaker to potentiate communication with readers.	THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Title: The title needs revision. Abstract: The abstract should clearly state study types (e.g. cross-sectional); also, the samples utilized (were samples newly drawn from patients or stored samples?); the abstract is part of your article that should best represent the quality of your findings. A proper revision of the whole section is highly recommended. Line 14: I don't think it's needed that the location be included in abstract; unless it's needed based on journal requirements. Line 30: The conclusion section says that people with co-infections experience more complications while, in the results section, no outcome scales showing this fact are included! The conclusion should not contain results (Line 31). Introduction: This section of the study should fairly justify the conduct of the study. In general, a more integrated introduction could be more helpful; also, the authors could have	Title was revised According to reviewer, was corrected The patients were allowed to perform tests . Serum samples of patients who request physician and patient satisfaction was. The patient seums were isolated and assays were performed Thus, serum, was isolated on admission, and testswere performed.
---------------------------------------	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	considered pointing out the importance of their project in their own clinical setting. Line 37: HIV stands for Human Immunodeficiency Virus; Line 47: AIDS stands for Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome; Materials and methods: Significant revision is required. The exact method of sample size estimation and sample selection should be lined out. It should be explained what proportion of the samples were selected from inpatient sera, which hospital wards were the patients admitted to, and the logic behind these choices. It is also essential to state how patients' samples were used, if people knew about the study, was there an informed consent provided, where was the project submitted to and did any Ethics Review Board appreciate its conduct? What database was used to extract demographic characteristics? If a checklist was used, it should be pointed out. Results: It is highly recommended that results and discussion sections be separated.	According to reviewer, was corrected Sampling was conducted in 2013 at the request of the physician and patient satisfaction. This study was conducted primarily March through the end of February The objectives of this study were reviewed in 2013 and According to the statistical activities of the partners that all inpatients and outpatients attending physician requests for testing were examined in the study.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The provided data in results section could better be presented in a table, instead of the figure used. A brief description added to a well-developed table could be more informative than this confusing presentation of the findings. The only section of the study that should not include any references is the results section. Comparison of your findings with other studies should be kept for discussion session. The discussion could also be more developed considering the existing clinical and epidemiological concerns in the country. References: More online search would definitely be helpful in finding more updated articles to help authors both in presenting their goal and major objectives to conduct this study; and also in providing valuable information to the readers who work in the field.	This study was approved by the research ethics committee This study was approved by the research ethics committee with a letter to the Issue 129/93/6012 results and discussion sections was separated. Table was added. According to reviewer, references was corrected
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It has not been provided whether the study proposal was admitted to an ethics review board; it's not clear whether collected samples were taken from patients or stores sera; no info is provided regarding presence of an informed consent.	
---	--	--