



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_50183
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON LABORATORY DIAGNOSIS OF MYCOBACTERIUM TUBERCULOSIS
Type of the Article	Review 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>Manuscript is quite interesting and has some sense of novelty. The authors should react to the following comments and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check for typographical and grammatical errors in the abstract and the body of the work. 2. Key words not properly written. Use key words and not statements/Highlights. 3. Abstract should conform to the standard format (Introduction, Body and Conclusion/Recommendation). 4. Table 1 should come within the work but not in the intro. Section. 5. Citations/References should be written following Journal's guidelines. 6. Avoid unnecessary capitalizations and unnecessary statements should be expunged from the work. 7. Immunological techniques should come first before Nucleic acid-based test. 8. Introduce all abbreviations in your work before using the acronyms. 9. State future prospects of the study and limitations of the tests. 10. Please strictly adhere to the Journal style for presenting Review papers. 11. References should be arranged based on Journal guidelines. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Checked and corrected. 2. Corrected and highlighted in yellow (line 24-25). 3. Noted and followed accordingly (line 20-250), highlighted in yellow. 4. The table was used to orderly list the members of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> and <i>M. avium complex</i> to avoid ponderosity. Introducing this organism and mentioning its family members is the core part of the introduction, thus may not make more sense else way. 5. Author's guidelines strictly followed. 6. Noted and corrected. 7. Noted and corrected (line 98-200). 8. All abbreviations are introduced before used. 9. The future prospectus of the study is stated in line 23-25. The limitations of the different techniques are shown in table 2. 10. Yes 11. Noted and corrected accordingly.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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>	No.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>