

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_120884</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Visceral leishmaniasis and hepatitis B virus/C virus coinfection: a potential challenge for treatment</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>There are many weak points in this paper</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It doesn't have a novelty.</li> <li>2. It has a small sample size</li> <li>3. There are no validation methods that confirm the diagnosis of the VL and other type HBV and HCV.</li> <li>4. The methodology is not enough.</li> <li>5. the gap of the study is not clear</li> <li>6. The structure of the abstract is not clear and it doesn't have the aim of the study.</li> <li>7. The data of all samples (315) are not included</li> <li>8. The discussion part is weak</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>It is ok</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>I would like to add some points</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The aim of the study should be clear</li> <li>2. The methodology used was not included</li> <li>3. The conclusion is not confirmed</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>The headings and subheadings are appropriate</b></p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>There are many reasons for my decision. First, the structure of the abstract is not enough as well as the gap and the aim of the study is not clear. Second: This study is lack of the novelty. Third, the method section is not enough and does not have a statistical analysis. Fourth, the result section is too small and has only one table that mentions the number of cases used. Finally the discussion part is not too weak and lacks the structure of each paragraph.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>They used good references</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality is not too bad. But it needs to improve</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dhafer Alghezi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Medicine, University of Thi-Qar, Iraq</b>