



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Although the authors sent a modified manuscript and the responses to our comments and suggestions, many of the observations were not covered as requested. Therefore, the manuscript is still not suitable for publication in its present form. Some examples: 1. The manuscript still lack of clarity. It needs editing. 2. The introduction is very long and repetitive with the discussion section. 3. The addition of the suggested references in lines 316-317 without modifying the text accordingly (PFO A is the one characterized as an adhesin, not PFO B). Leaving the text as it is in the revised version, it will be a source of misinformation. The authors need to adjust the text accordingly. 4. The authors did not include the TVAG_ for the genes used in the PCR assays as requested. 5. Neither had they included a brief description of the DNA purification method from clinical samples. This information is key for the paper. 6. Fig. 1 legend still lack clarity. According to the text, the clinical samples were classified based on the patient as symptomatic and asymptomatic and suspected to be infected with Tv. 7. The most critical and delicate problem is that the data in Fig. 1 seem to be identical as part of the Fig. 1B presented in the new reference added: (Sonkar et al., 2016 Biosensors & Bioelectronics 86:41-47), but with less contrast and only the first 7 of the 10 clinical samples analyzed. It surprise me that they are using the same data in the two studies made with samples from patients attending two different Indian health institutions and enrolled in a similar study. Please check and correct as need it.	1. A thorough editing has been done as suggested by the reviewer. 2. Introduction and discussion as been modified to remove unnecessary repetition. 3. The text has been corrected accordingly. 4. TVAG_ for the genes has been added (please see revised text on page no. 6). 5. Brief description of the DNA purification method has now been included in material and methods section (please see revised text on page no. 5 and 6). 6. A new Figure 1 and revised legend has been included (please see on page no. 22 of revised manuscript). Figure shows the representative gel picture from randomly selected seven clinical samples. 7. We are thankful to the reviewer for pointing this out. Since this study has been done in collaboration with Sonkar et al., group therefore in order to avoid any confusion, the group has been asked to perform a new PCR experiment from the representative samples and a new gel picture has been obtained for this study.

