



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)
Compulsory 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.	
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Line 11, Remove one "at"; Line 21, Cavity was present, not presented; Line 28, use either "with" or "having" and not both; Introduction: Line 40, Replace "higher" with "more"; Line 41, "and it was....." I think it is still the gold standard, so should read "and it remains" 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....."; Similar error in line 46. Line 50 should read ".....which are rarely performed....." There are wrong use of the word "therefore" throughout the work e.g lines 30, 48, ; Line 50 should read "....due to time consumption, cost and availability of facilities....."; Line 55-58, from what value did it increase to 85% or decrease to 66% and over what length of time? Methods: Line 75, "presence of" not "present of"; Line 96, replace "... were performed....." with ".....were treated with" ; Lines 138-140, please put the reference for the figure quoted as success rate; Results, Line 156, "were as follows", not "as followed", Similar error in line 163; Line 160, "HIV infection" is more appropriate than "HIV positive"; Discussion: Line 312-313, On what ground did you say	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	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? Line 326-327, do you mean significantly influent or influenced; Line 334, please remove "to"; Line 340, what do you mean by "updating" WHO recommendation, explain how. Line 342-343, be specific about the "two groups"; Line 358, do you mean "great source of concern"?; Line 362, "used" not "using"; 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	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ojide Chiedozie. K.
Department, University & Country	Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, University of Uyo Teaching Hospital, Uyo, Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria.