



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7885
Title of the Manuscript:	DISCORDANCES BETWEEN SPUTUM SMEAR AND CULTURE CONVERSION RATES IN NEWLY DIAGNOSED PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS: A PROSPECTIVE STUDY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRY
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Result: Lines 182-184, The author(s) stated that 38 of 266 and 7 of 249 were culture positive at 2 nd and 5 th months of treatment, but table 2 shows it is 38 of 259 and 7 of 248, explain, or are these errors? Please crosscheck very well.	Revised the statements: "38 of 266 (14.4%) patients at the second month of treatment and 7 of 249 (2.8%) patients at the fifth month of treatment." to "Of 266 patients remaining at second month, culture could not be obtained from 7 patients because of contamination while 38 patients were culture positive. Furthermore, of 249 patients remaining at fifth month, culture could not be obtained from one patient because of contamination while 7 patients were culture positive."
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: 1. Line 11, Remove one "at"	Removed "at" and revised according to format: "Queen Savang Vadhana Memorial Hospital"
	2. Line 21, Cavity was present, not presented	Replaced, "presented" with " present" "cavity was presented in 31.1%" to "cavity was present in 31.1%"
	3. Line 28, use either "with" or "having" and not both	Removed "with" "patients with having cough" to "patients having cough"



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Introduction: 1. Line 40, Replace “higher” with “more”	Replaced “higher” with “more” “Mycobacterium culture is higher sensitive than sputum smear microscopy” to “Mycobacterium culture is more sensitive than sputum smear microscopy”
	2. Line 41, “and it was.....” I think it is still the gold standard, so should read “and it remains”	Replaced “was” with “remains” “it was the gold standard” to “it remains the gold standard”
	3. Line 44-45, please reframe the statement to convey better understanding e.g “false positive AFB smear was reported by 44-51%” should read “reported to be.....”	Replaced “by” with “to be” “false positive AFB smear was reported by 44-51%” to “false positive AFB smear was reported to be 44-51%”
	Similar error in line 46.	“The primary multidrug resistant TB (MDR-TB) was estimated globally by 3.6%” to “The primary multidrug resistant TB (MDR-TB) was estimated globally to be 3.6%”
	4. Line 50 should read “.....which are rarely performed.....”	Revised the statement “culture and drug susceptibility test (DST) result which rarely perform” to “culture and drug susceptibility test (DST) result which are rarely performed ”
	5. There are wrong use of the word “therefore” throughout the work e.g lines 30, 48.	Removed the word “therefore” “Therefore, the diagnosis of primary MDR-TB depend on mycobacterium culture and drug susceptibility test (DST) result” to “The diagnosis of primary MDR-TB depend on



SDI Review Form 1.6

		mycobacterium culture and drug susceptibility test (DST) result” “Therefore, treatment monitoring for pulmonary TB in Thailand is generally relied on sputum smear” to “Treatment monitoring for pulmonary TB in Thailand is generally relied on sputum smear” “Therefore, these factors could be use as the signal of discordance between sputum AFB smear and culture requiring close monitoring for anti-tuberculous response.” to “These factors could be use as the signal of discordance between sputum AFB smear and culture requiring close monitoring for anti-tuberculous response.”
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Line 50 should read “....due to time consumption, cost and availability of facilities.....”	Revised the statement “due to time-consuming, expensive and available only in some intermediate laboratory levels.” to “due to time-consumption, cost and availability of facilities”
	7. Line 55-58, from what value did it increase to 85% or decrease to 66% and over what length of time?	Clarified the statement “Treatment success in Thailand gradually increased and recently, it was able to reach WHO goal of 85% in 2009 and 2010 [1]. On the other hand, relapse cases keep increasing since 2000 while trend of success rate among these cases declined over the past few years to 66% in 2010 [1].” to “Treatment success in Thailand gradually increased from 64% in 1995 and recently, it was able to reach WHO goal of 85% in 2009 and 2010 [1]. On the other hand, relapse cases keep increasing since 2000 while success rate among these cases declined from 68% in 2009 to 66% in 2010 [1].”
	Methods: 1. Line 75, “presence of” not “present of”	Replaced “present of” with “presence of” “due to present of abnormal chest radiography” to “due to presence of abnormal chest radiography”
	2. Line 96, replace “... were performed.....” with “.....were treated with”	Replaced “... were performed.....” with “.....were treated with” “All specimens were performed standard digestion and decontamination” to “All specimens were treated with standard digestion and decontamination”



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Lines 138-140, please put the reference for the figure quoted as success rate	Reference was provided. "Thailand national TB program monitoring and evaluation report 2006-2007 showing 77% cure rate of new AFB smear positive patients [14]"
	Results: 1. Line 156, "were as follows", not "as followed", Similar error in line 163;	Replaced "were as follows" with "as followed" "Majorities were as followed" to "Majorities were as follows" "Other common symptoms were as followed" to "Other common symptoms were as follows"
	2. Line 160, "HIV infection" is more appropriate than "HIV positive";	Replaced "HIV positive" with "HIV infection" "HIV positive (34/296, 11.9%)" to "HIV infection (34/296, 11.9%)"
	Discussion: 1. Line 312-313, On what ground did you say that specificity of AFB smear for monitoring treatment response is low when you had figures like 89.6% and 97.5% for 2 nd and 5 th months of treatments respectively?	According to the 89.6% and 97.5% specificity of AFB smear at for 2 nd and 5 th months of treatments, it should not be stated that the specificity of AFB smear for monitoring treatment response is low. Then the word "specificity" was removed. "In this study, sensitivity and specificity of AFB smear for monitoring treatment response were low." to In this study, sensitivity of AFB smear for monitoring treatment response was low.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Line 326-327, do you mean significantly influent or influenced	Replaced “influent” with “influenced” “Discordance between sputum AFB smear and culture in this study were significantly influent by bacilli load.” to “Discordance between sputum AFB smear and culture in this study were significantly influenced by bacilli load.”
	3. Line 334, please remove “to”	Removed “to” “contrasting to WHO recommendation” to “ contrasting WHO recommendation”
	4. Line 340, what do you mean by “updating” WHO recommendation, explain how.	Revised the statement “WHO recommendation should be update and encouraged in a real practice.” to “ The latest WHO recommendation should be informed and encouraged in a real practice”
	5. Line 342-343, be specific about the “two groups”	Revised the statement “Although only one adverse event was significantly different among two groups” to “Although only one adverse event was significantly different between patients with and without discordance of sputum AFB smear and culture at second month of treatment ”
	6. Line 358, do you mean “great source of concern”?	Yes, I do. Revised the statement “patients with sputum smear positive at the second month of treatment are great of concern” to “patients with sputum smear positive at the second month of treatment are great source of concern”



SDI Review Form 1.6

	7. Line 362, “used” not “using”;	Replaced “using” with “used” “conventional microscopy using in this study” to “conventional microscopy used in this study”
	8. Reference section is fairly alright.	-
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript as it is now is difficult to read and requires and editorial input. It is however scientifically sound ethical approvals and consents were obtained. However they did not reflect in the methods section	The corrections were strictly followed the reviewer’s comment and the manuscript was critically revised. Ethical approvals and consents were put before reference section according to author instruction