



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_67572
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation: Four Chemiluminescent SARS-Cov-2 Immunoassays & Rapid-Card Test in Mild Disease and Seroprevalence of SARS CoV-2 in Frontline Healthcare Workers
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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>I read with interest the manuscript. It is well written and relevant.</p> <p>1. However, the selection of subjects to study seroprevalence needs to be clarified further. The manuscript currently states - "Participant selection was randomly done to cover staff from all sections of the hospital having direct interface with patients and/ or their attendants and they were grouped depending on frequency of contact to patients/ attendants visiting the hospital into the following groups..... A total of 605 frontline HCWs were recruited for the study. Study population was further divided into: (i) Known positive (infected and recovered) HCW: 100 frontline HCW..... (ii) Known negatives (asymptomatic frontline HCW: 505 asymptomatic frontline health care workers"</p> <p>Were the 100 positive HCWs removed from the pool after randomization? If so, this should be specified as that will affect the randomization of sample for estimating seroprevalence and introduce selection bias.</p> <p>2. Asymptomatic healthcare workers have been labelled as "known negative" in Methods section and in Table II. Since they were not screened by RTPCR, it may be more appropriate to label them as "Asymptomatic" only.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "...ongoing pandemic[1] a major global concern." The phrase "a major global concern is superfluous since it has already been stated that COVID-19 is a pandemic. Consider deletion of phrase. <p>Methods section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In selection of known positive HCW, a timeline of >10 days to 2.5 months has been chosen. Would advise clarification of reason for choosing those thresholds. <p>Results section 3.3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. "Around 29.1% of seropositive HCW had never been diagnosed with COVID-19 infection." Does this imply that 70.9% of seropositive HCWs (designated in asymptomatic group were diagnosed with COVID in past ? If so, this should be explicitly stated. <p>Disucssion section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The discussion is well written but is lacking a consolidated description of limitations of current study. This should be included. 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Suman Pal</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of New Mexico, USA</i>