

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21982

**Title:** Immunodiagnosis of human hydatid disease: Where do we stand?

**Reviewer's code:** 00069105

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-06 10:03

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-16 00:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is well written, easy to read and nice updated. Tables are perhaps too big. Main problem is that it would be called a classical review very well done. But now systematic reviews should fit new rules, including type of search, years, words in search, .. Perhaps it is easy to do or it is too much work. I have explained my ideas to editor so they will inform about the decision

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21982

**Title:** Immunodiagnosis of human hydatid disease: Where do we stand?

**Reviewer's code:** 00225349

**Reviewer's country:** Belgium

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-06 10:03

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-06 17:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written and specifically focused informative review article addressing methodological aspects for the laboratory diagnosis of a parasitic infectious disease of importance for many developing countries. This reviewer would recommend its publication in WJM after necessary editing and careful proofreading.