



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17492
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Tuberculosis Surveillance System in District Hyderabad, Province Sindh-Pakistan, 2012
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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- SENSITIVITY was 26% , should be another method more sensitive to compare 2- The surveillance system at sentinel sites is a tool for early detection but timeliness is poor 3- surveillance systems helps the decision makers to set the priorities but stability was 66% 4- should be implication of feedback within surveillance system 5- you should have bench mark with yourself and national and international 6- some references very old 1988 and definition were changed .	1. Sir I tried to accomplish your raised comments, present in manuscript with yellow highlight in sensitivity portion 2. Sir I used word sentinel sites for the health facilities where diagnostic and curative (DOTS) services were present and working under the supervision of National TB control Program. These health facilities responsible for submission of reports from one level to next level after three month (passive quarterly reporting system) due to which timeliness was poor. 3. Sir you are right that system helps the decision makers to set the priorities but system was working with the financial and technical support of multinational donor so variation in funding may effect on its stability. That was the only reason average 66.6% stability. Sir after your comments I discuss this point in the discussion section make conclusion and recommendation (present in yellow



SDI Review Form 1.6

		highlight in above mention sections) 4. In the 154 line I already conclude that there is absence of feedback system but didn't mention with in surveillance system. I agreed with the reviewer comments and adding few word in the above mention line and line 161 5. Didn't understand the reviewer comments. Bench mark? 6. I am agreed for references notified by reviewer and I replaced it with new reference
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		