

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 62046

Title: Comparison of indirect immunofluorescence and western blot method in

diagnosis of hantavirus infections

Reviewer's code: 03633770

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Croatia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 06:34

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-27 13:22

Review time: 8 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Introduction section needs some information/basic knowledge of comparative techniques included molecular techniques. 2. There is lack of novelty as the similar studies already confirm the presence of hantavirus in patient samples. 3.What is new presented by author? 4. The results section needs the original images of results of western blot analysis. 5. There is lack of concern letter of patients included in the current work. This may be a cause of ethical issues. 6. What was the rational to set two endpoint i.e. Death and severe respiratory complications. 7. The sample size may little increase. Also included some positive and negative control. 8. More

experiments are essential requirements of the current work which includes RT-PCR/Real time Florecent-ELISA . 9. Lack of current information in the present study. Minor comments 1. There are various grammatical and typo error throughout the MS 2. Conclusion also needs to revise with the light of results. 3. English should be revised in some parts of paper.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 62046

Title: Comparison of indirect immunofluorescence and western blot method in

diagnosis of hantavirus infections

Reviewer's code: 03633770

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Croatia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-01 02:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-16 01:30

Review time: 14 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



Comments to author: The study carried out in the current manuscript entitled Comparison of indirect immunofluorescence and western blot method in diagnosis of hantavirus infections can be accepted for the publication but need to check the typo error if any.