

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_77522
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the frequency of the Toll-like 2 gene polymorphism in leprosy
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript reports on Toll-like receptor 2 polymorphism in leprosy patients. This is not a new topic and the results are few. It should be structured in the form of a brief report.</li> <li>2. A control case study needs age and gender matching between cases and controls, preferably in the 1:2 ratio.</li> <li>3. If the authors intend to discriminate by city, both cases and controls must be from the same city. If they want to discriminate by state, both cases and controls need to be from the same state, not necessarily from the same city. Nonetheless in both situations, cases and controls need to be born in the city or state.</li> <li>4. In respect to the controls: they should not be household contacts, because of the familiar genetics. They should be from the local population.</li> <li>5. The number of participants is too small considering that is not a new discovery (see Kang and Chae, 2001).</li> <li>6. Why did not the authors study at the same time another SNP?</li> <li>7. Discussion should be redone after the new modifications.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction: Please use more recent epidemiological data (ref. 3).</li> <li>2. It is better to use the words <b>interact with</b> mycobacterial components than <b>detect</b>.</li> <li>3. It is better to redo the paragraph on cell signaling by <i>M. leprae</i>, distinguishing the action when the components of the mycobacterium interact with nonpolymorphic Toll-like receptors, therefore, pro inflammatory mechanisms and when they interact with polymorphic receptors.</li> <li>4. The authors should mention in the introduction the reason they chose to evaluate the SNP rs3804100. Also, they should mention (before their choice) the study done by Kang and Chae (2001), describing which SNP they have studied.</li> <li>5. Methods: What does it mean spontaneous demand?</li> <li>6. Methods: Which criteria were used to diagnose the patients?</li> <li>7. In which institutions have they been selected?</li> <li>8. QIAGEN, please mention the country.</li> <li>9. Platinum Taq (please mention the Laboratory and country).</li> <li>10. The termocycler should be included in the procedure, also, its brand and country</li> <li>11. Was Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium tested for the SNP?</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**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><i>Aparecida Tiemi Nagao Dias</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universidade Federal Do Ceara, Brasil</i></b>