



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_35995
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of soluble inducible T cell co stimulator (sICOS) as a prognostic biomarker for patients with chronic hepatitis C Virus
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>)

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 language of the paper is not good enough. Abstract: in the methodology only two groups are introduced. In the results the authors introduce three groups. The authors do not write if the study was approved by an ethical committee. Did the authors verify the normal distribution of the data? Table 1 is not necessary; the age of the groups is mentioned in the text. Table 2 is not necessary; the gender distribution of the groups is mentioned in the text.	- Group III had been added to the abstract - Approval of the ethical committee highlighted in the methodology - table 1, 2 deleted
Minor REVISION comments	Line 104: Standard deviation misses.	SD had been added
Optional/General comments	The authors did not discuss why sICOS as a mean for diagnosis would be better than the viral load.	This part had been added in the introduction