Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**General Comments:** **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.** **This manuscript is generally well written, very clear and well-conceived. However, there are few comments from reviewer to improve the paper.** **Introduction** **1) The author should highlighted the days of fever (<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.** **Method:** **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 of100 respondents ? please highlighted the calculation formula]** **Result** **1) The author should highlighted the result of control groups.** **Conclusion** **1. The first statement of the paragraph was not suitable for conclusion (should be in Introduction).**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Lim kuang kuay**
Department, University & Country	**Malaysia**