



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13703
Title of the Manuscript:	Does co-suffering by ischemic heart disease and tuberculosis exist in community endemic for these diseases?
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	Here are my comments: 1) TITLE: Long and confusing: I would recommend it to be "ISCHEMIC HEART DISEASE AND TUBERCULOSIS DO REALLY CO-EXISTING IN COMMUNITY ENDEMIC AREAS?" 2) ABSTRACT: Objective of the study is not mentioned Aim of the study: It seems that it is small introduction not an Aim. Recommended Aim: To study the co-existence of IHD and T.B 3) Introduction: Very long IT SHOULDNT CONTAIN: OBJECTIVE 4) Methodology and Data analysis: No negative comments 5) Results: Too many tables needed to be summarized 6) Discussion: Weak, the results has to be analysed and compared to other similar studies, almost no other	1) Title: Title of the study as suggested by the valuable reviewer does not mention the co-suffering, in stead it tells about the co-existence (misspelled as CO-EXCISTING by mistake) beforehand. Contrary the title given in the study keeps the inquisitiveness intact and develops the interest to read further. So the title of the study has been kept same. 2) Abstract: Objective has been added in the abstract 3) Unnecessary parts in introduction have not mentioned by reviewer: so the introduction has not changed 4) NO action taken since there was not any negative comment 5) We feel all tables are necessary 6) We could not trace similar type of



SDI Review Form 1.6

	studies compared to this study	epidemiological study except the one done in Russia which was analyzed in introduction and discussion parts.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		