SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_32393**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Comparison of Parasitological Techniques (microscopy) and Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP) of DNA in Diagnosis and Monitoring Treatment of Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense Infection in Vervet Monkeys (Chlorocebus aethiops)**
Type of the 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	The paper tries to address an important issue, given the ability of the LAMP technique to be operated at low resources and a cost. However, the study appears to be still at the preliminary stages. Please address the following comments before the paper can be considered for publication. 1. There are only two samples being assessed. 2. The way the efficiency has been calculated is not clear. 3. The paper talks about comparing LAMP technique to microscopy. But have used only two samples, which is not statistically acceptable. 4. The table 2 indicates N=78. What does that mean? **5.** To claim that LAMP can be effectively used it first has to be validated, in comparison to a gold standard technique. The authors should increase the number of samples and do a proper validation of the technique and calculate the specificity and the sensitivity of the assay in local settings. **6.** The efficiency of microscopy and LAMP in blood has been claimed as 28% and 60% respectively; but is not clear with respect to what method of diagnosis those numbers have been derived. **7.** The LAMP is prone to giving very high numbers of false positives. Have the authors ruled out the false positives using negative	**There are changes in the affiliation of the authors and one author has been added and all corrections are highlighted in yellow**

	control samples?	
Minor REVISION comments	**8.** In general there are many grammatical errors throughout the paper. Kindly pay attention. **9.** The discussion is too lengthy and unfocused. Lot of unnecessary information on the advantages of LAMP technique in general, which are already known to the scientific community.	
Optional/General comments		