

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_111401
Title of the Manuscript:	CHLAMYDIOSIS INFECTION AND ASSOCIATION WITH SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AMONG WOMEN IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. The findings presented accurately will be useful to understand the prevalence of chlamydia infection among women. However, use of serology tests for chlamydia diagnosis is a concern as better tests eg: NAAT using urine and cervical samples are widely available currently. According to literature IgG antibodies are not helpful to diagnose acute infections and can not differentiate serovars. However, they are useful in chronic infections PID, LGV and SARA.</p> <p>Better to use "CHLAMYDIA INFECTION AMONG WOMEN IN PORT HARCOURT, NIGERIA AND ASSOCIATION WITH SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS".</p> <p>Abstract need to be rewritten after the improvements to the article as suggested.</p> <p>Methodology and materials need to be made clear including details of the study population, sampling frame, time period and sample size.</p> <p>Chlamydia IgG tests were used. It is better to justify why serology was used without using NAAT tests for urine/cervical samples. Under study area the quality of laboratory services at the hospital need to be explained including internal and external quality control.</p> <p>Results section is really important. Explain the sample at the beginning giving the prevalence of chlamydia in the total sample. Present the data in frequency tables first before analysing associations.</p> <p>These are important findings which needs to be presented clearly. Methods and materials need to be explained in detail to understand that the study is not biased.</p> <p>It is better to improve references as some references are not suitable for scientific journal eg: 2,3 as they are for general public health information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language needs to be improved preferably by a third party.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Use of serology tests for chlamydia diagnosis is a concern as better tests eg: NAAT using urine and cervical samples are widely available currently. According to literature IgG antibodies are not helpful to diagnose acute infections and can not differentiate serovars. However, they are useful in chronic infections PID, LGV and SARA.</p> <p>Methodology and materials need to be made clear including details of the study population, sampling frame, time period and sample size. Study population is not described properly. It is important to explain who, when and how? It is better to indicate how the women were selected. If we say randomly selected then the sampling frame need to be given with the time period. According to the inclusion criteria, women registered at the institution were enrolled in the study. Healthy volunteers need to be removed from the study. It is not clear how the groups were identified as HIV patients, pregnant and OPD patients. Was it in the methodology to identify patients from these groups. If so please explain clearly in the methods. Random selection need to be explained clearly to avoid biases.</p> <p>Chlamydia IgG tests were used. It is better to justify why serology was used without using NAAT tests for urine/cervical samples. Under study area the quality of laboratory services at the hospital need to be explained including internal and external quality control.</p> <p>Results section is really important. Explain the sample at the beginning giving the prevalence of chlamydia in the total sample. Sample size will be <450 after removing healthy volunteers. 35 women were positive for chlamydia ab test. Present the data in frequency tables first before analysing associations.</p> <p>Eg: Age group No. 15-25 26-35</p> <p>Total</p> <p>Association tables need to be redone.</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Independent variable eg: age</th><th>Chlamydia positive</th><th>Negative</th><th>Total</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>15-25</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>26- 35</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <p>These are important findings which needs to be presented clearly. Methods and materials need to be explained in detail to understand that the study is not biased.</p> <p>Discussion should be developed based on the results presented preferably in that order. Prevalence levels are given in the discussion but not explained in the results section. First organize the results section and based on the findings develop the discussion.</p> <p>It is better to improve references as some references are not suitable for scientific journal eg: 2,3 as they are for general public health information.</p>	Independent variable eg: age	Chlamydia positive	Negative	Total	15-25				26- 35				.				.				Total				
Independent variable eg: age	Chlamydia positive	Negative	Total																							
15-25																										
26- 35																										
.																										
.																										
Total																										

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leelani Rajapaksa
Department, University & Country	Sri Lanka