



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. <i>T.vaginalis</i> should be written as <i>T. vaginalis</i>. 2. Before 'respectively', should put a comma (,) sign e.g. 20.7% and 18.6%, respectively. 3. Trichomonas infection should be written as <i>Trichomonas</i> infection. 4. Shorten the 3rd paragraph in your Introduction e.g. Various sero-diagnostic techniques have been applied to demonstrate..... 5. I am not really agree with your definition of 'true positive'. You should compare it with the gold standard not from your own definition or judgement, 'a'. 6. What is the important of Table 1? I suggest you remove it. 7. Why you want to analyse it according to symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects towards each method? Do you want to proof that for symptomatic subjects, it is good to use A method instead of B and C methods? 8. Remove 3.2 Clinical findings of the symptomatic subjects (Results section). 9. What is the relevant of having 3.6 Comparative analysis in different age groups? (Results section) 10. I suggest you to re-arrange the paragraph in the Discussion section, and some of the paragraph can be shorten as it does not reflect the main objective of this study. 11. After all, I think you should compare your <i>pfoB</i> with other genes that have been used in PCR assay, not compare it with a traditional wet smear examination.	1. Done 2. done 3. done 4. done 5. Due to lack of an efficient Gold Standard method for diagnosis of <i>T. vaginalis</i> and lower sensitivity of wet smear examination and culture method, we evaluated the diagnostic efficacy and kappa value of <i>T. vaginalis</i> by multiple techniques in various combinations. This was done to get best combination of two methods for better sensitivity and specificity. 6. This Table gives good information of various clinical details of the symptomatic patients with respect the different age groups. 7. Yes we agree. 8. N.A 9. Done 10. Done 11. We agree with reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	Please edit and check the usage of grammar. If possible, send this MS to the English native speaker.	Done.
Optional/General comments		