



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The main aim of this study was to evaluate newly established <i>pfoB</i> gene based PCR methods in combination with the known conventional techniques (wet smear) in symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects. The study was well-conducted, well-written, and with an enough number of people. Because <i>pfoB</i> gene is specific for <i>T.vaginalis</i> and does not show any cross reactivity with the genome of other microorganisms the authors proposal is good. The authors showed that the <i>pfoB</i> gene PCR followed by <i>18S rRNA</i> gene PCR presented the highest positivity among the <i>T.vaginalis</i> infected patients as compared to the wet smear examination method. These results showed that the PCR techniques (both <i>18S rRNA</i> and <i>pfoB</i>) are better for detection of <i>T.vaginalis</i> as compared to the conventional wet smear examination. However, it is important to mention that further studies are necessary to explore the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of diagnostic tests suggested by the authors.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 309, please remove comma (33), This study)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a good work that deserves publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Marlene Benchimol</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Unigranrio-Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i>