Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 41224

Title: Assessment of quality control system by sigma metrics and quality goal index ratio: A roadmap towards preparation for NABL

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-07-31

Date reviewed: 2018-08-01

Review time: 20 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[Y] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated the quality control of clinical laboratory test with sigma metrics. They concluded that sigma metrics was satisfactory. Were there any literatures on sigma metrics on laboratory tests? How were the present results compared with the

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

other data? How were the results compared with ISO standard 15189 in view of quality control? In Introduction, information would be necessary regarding sigma metrics. For example, how it was originally devised, the field of main use.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 41224

Title: Assessment of quality control system by sigma metrics and quality goal index ratio: A roadmap towards preparation for NABL

Reviewer's code: 03351479

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-07-31

Date reviewed: 2018-08-01

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good manuscript. However, there are several issues that may kindly be addressed for improvement of the manuscript. 1. The authors have stated as under As per laboratory policy, two levels of controls (level 2, normal and level 3, pathological)

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

were run on daily basis In this context it requires specific mention of the details of the internal quality control material used. Is it purchased from same agency although. 2. The instrument (Randox) make and model requires specific mention with its service report with its performance data. A sample service report of the system may be provided in the supplementary. 3. NABL accreditation certificate be provided in the supplementary. 4. The lab specific cut off value inding 1sd, 2sd etc one sample chart may be provided in the supplementary with an actual data. 5. How was the data (lab data) stored in the study period. 6. How many times Internal quality control was performed. This aspect should be elaborated with details. 7. It must be mentioned that the lab received any complains from end users documenting concerns about the analyses report or not 8. The instruments are run by qualified technologists or not and the report is signed by qualified persons as per law or not. 9. How often repeat analyses request comes from the clinician ? Any such data is maintained or not must be mentioned. 10. To explain the finds the authors have commented as under Strict monitoring as well as increased frequency of IQC run is required However, it is not mentioned what is the laboratory frequency of IQC in a day in the reporting period. This aspect must be included in the revised manuscript. I recommend for a Major Revision.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 41224

Title: Assessment of quality control system by sigma metrics and quality goal index ratio: A roadmap towards preparation for NABL

Reviewer's code: 02446387

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-08-14

Date reviewed: 2018-08-15

Review time: 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [ ] Advanced [Y] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very important paper that advocates the need to develop precise standards or criteria for improving health care quality measures. Most of terms used were clearly defined and used in the application. However, two terms need to be defined: 1)

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

analyses, and 2) outdoor. I assume that authors used the term "outdoor" as outpatient care.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No