

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_84320
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Analysis and Evaluation of Quantitative Real Time PCR for Diagnosis of Scrub Typhus in North-East India
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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>General Comments:</b> The authors of the manuscript titled, "Performance Analysis and Evaluation of Quantitative Real Time PCR for Diagnosis of Scrub Typhus in North-East India" have conducted a cross-sectional survey with the aims to evaluate the performance of qRT PCR in comparison to commonly used IgM ELISA and Weil-Felix tests to diagnose scrub typhus, in North-East India.</p> <p>This manuscript is generally well written, very clear and well-conceived. However, there are few comments from reviewer to improve the paper.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> 1) The author should highlighted the days of fever (&lt;7 days and 7-14 days) in this section. This will make the result more clearer when discuss the findings 2) The author recommended to highlighted the prevalence of the cases in the world and specifically in India.</p> <p><b>Method:</b> 1). The author should highlighted how the sample size of 20 respondents for control were calculated? Please justify this ratio compare to patients 2). How the author came up with sample size of 100 respondents ? please highlighted the calculation formula]</p> <p><b>Result</b> 1) The author should highlighted the result of control groups.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> 1. The first statement of the paragraph was not suitable for conclusion (should be in Introduction).</p>	<p><b>Response:</b> Please find responses to the individual comments as follows</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> 1. Details regarding duration of fever and its categorisation has been updated in the manuscript and highlighted. Pages – 4,9 2. No specific data is available regarding prevalence of the disease, so not mentioned. Statement is highlighted. Page -2</p> <p><b>Method</b> 1. The number of patients considered as control was based on as per manufacturer's instructions. Change highlighted. Page – 5 2. No formula was used to calculate the sample size due to lack of prevalence data. The sample size was restricted to 100 due to resource constrains and to achieve the feasibility of the study. Similar point has been mentioned and highlighted in the sub section 4.1. Page - 13</p> <p><b>Result</b> 1. Healthy controls were used to set the cut off control of ELISA, the result of which has been mentioned in the sub-subsection 2.8.2 and highlighted. Page – 5</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> 1. Changes made and highlighted. Page - 13</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Ethical approval was taken from the institutional Ethics Committee, letter no. - NEIGR/IEC/2019/0040. Page - 14