



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9752
Title of the Manuscript:	Feasibility for Same Day Tuberculosis Diagnosis Using the Smear Microscopy Approach in Rural South Western Uganda
Type of the Article	Short 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	none	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1 . What do you mean when you say “smear microscopy is quality assured” Do you mean that the smear has to be respond to Bertlett’s or Murray Washington score? Or what else?</p> <p>2. Please consider this publication <u>Indian J Tuberc</u>. 2011 Oct;58(4):160-7. A pilot study of same day sputum smear examination, its feasibility and usefulness in diagnosis of pulmonary TB. <u>Myneedu VP¹, Verma AK, Sharma PP, Behera D.</u> in which the author reaches different conclusion (about the same day smear) and add a comment in the discussion</p>	<p>1: smear microscopy is quality assured” was meant to mean places which participate in external quality assurance systems for microscopy. I have rephrased the statement to read “The WHO has recently recommended that in countries where WHO-recommended external microscopy quality assurance systems are in place and good-quality microscopy results have been documented, it is sufficient to examine two specimens per patient and that these specimens can be collected in an accelerated scheme”</p> <p>2. I have read the reference modified the discussion accordingly</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Yes, but the author obtained the written consent as well as the ethical approval	We obtained verbal consent as the procedure we did were routine procedures.