

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_130106
Title of the Manuscript:	Breaking the Diagnostic Enigma: Brucella Infection in the Spectrum of Pyrexia of unknown origin at Tertiary Care Hospitals in North India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Brucellosis diagnosis has always been difficult for clinicians and diagnosticians alike. A knowledge of seroprevalence of diseases in the community along with occupational history is of paramount importance in diagnosing such difficult to diagnose but easy to treat diseases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternative title: Breaking the Diagnostic Enigma: Brucella Infection in the Spectrum of Pyrexia of unknown origin- One Year Experience at a Tertiary Care Hospital in North India.	Title revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The article says, the diagnostic success rate was 61.7%. Please clarify as the numbers of all diagnosed cases (rheumatoid+ Tuberculosis+ typhoid+ brucella etc) when added up comes to 79%.</p> <p>The language in the abstract is confusing.</p> <p>13% of cases out of 94 patients were diagnosed as Brucellosis by serology. This should be 12 patients. But the number mentioned in the study is n=13. Please clarify.</p> <p>The study says Brucella seroprevalence was 13%. In the discussion, the authors write it was 10.6% and 3.2% for IgM and IgG respectively. Please clarify.</p> <p>As per the study, all female patients were housewives. Is there any history of livestock contact in them?</p>	<p>Effectuated revision</p> <p>Revised</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Numbering to be checked.	Checked
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs improvement- grammatical errors	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	