



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	none	
Minor 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>	
Optional/General comments	Yes, but the author obtained the written consent as well as the ethical approval	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carl Fontana
Department, University & Country	Tor Vergata University of Rome, Italy