



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_29557
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of DNA based techniques for the diagnosis of Human Vaginal trichomoniasis in North Indian Population
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1- Line 12: The present study was aimed to (delete was). 2- Line 106: The present study was aimed to (delete was). 3- Line 194-197: All figures not present in table 1. 4- Line 211-212: The analysis of complaints among all the age groups was found to be significant ($p=0.0007$). Not found in table 1. 5- Line 216: You used 2 abbreviations for "Per-vaginal examination; PV and P/V, so use one of them only. 6- Line 225-232: It is better to put the new classification of age groups in a table to clear the new percents and the statistical analysis. 7- Line 247: 10 (3%) out of 344 symptomatic and 2 (3.56%) out of 56 asymptomatic women (it must be: 10 (2.91%) out of 344 symptomatic and 2 (3.57%) out of 56 asymptomatic women). 8- Line 302: I can't find these figures (20.7% and 18.6%) in tables. 9- Conclusion should be obtained from your own work, so delete "and 'gold standard' culture methods".	1. Done 2. Done 3. New Table 1 has been included in the revised manuscript showing data details. 4. The P values are only mentioned in text but not in figure. 5. Correction has been made. 6. We agree with the reviewer, but initially we wanted to compare individually each age group and later in combination, but it's difficult to put all data in one table, which will make it too complicated. 7. Correction is done. 8. Correction is done. 9. Done.
Minor REVISION comments	1- Line 14: for the diagnosis of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> in symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects (add). 2- Line 29: was found to be between 86.8 and 100% & 35.5 and 66%, respectively. 3- Line 66: 96.7% of women (add). 4- Line 81: OSOM, mention the full term at first. 5- Line 107: for the diagnosis of <i>Trichomonas vaginalis</i> (add). 6- Line 217-218: You used 2 abbreviations for "Per-	1. Correction Done 2. Done 3. Done 4. OSOM is name of brand/company, which makes TV diagnostic kits. 5. Done 6. Done. 7. Done 8. Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	speculum examination; PS and P/S, so use one of them only. 7- Line 300: microscopy (28) In 8- Line 309: (33) This study. 9- Line 341: wet smear Intriguingly. 10- Line 343-344: One probable reason.	9. Done 10.Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- Language and grammar need to be improved. 2- Title of figures must be put under them. 3- Tables and figures must be self explanatory. 4- Any abbreviation must be preceded by the full term. 5- In figure 1: Write the exact sensitivity percent of each bar. 6- Statistical analysis is not clear in tables and figure 2.	All corrections are included as suggested by reviewer.