



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_45422
Title of the Manuscript:	Tuberculosis situation in El-Minia governorate (1997-2010) before and after Direct Observed Therapy Short Course Strategy (DOTS)
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>)

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	The time periods chosen, by the author for the review of the records, is probably too old to reflect the current situations of things in the study area. The result therefore may not be relevant to the reality on ground now. It is properly done for an academic purpose. There is a need to do a total overhauling of the use of English language for the article to have a good meaning and to be able to effectively convey its intended message. The referencing of materials is too old. The author will be better off discussing his or her results using more recent studies.	I am agree with you but we already prepare more recent study up to date to reflect our situations and this old one is important for comparison to detect our mistakes, success and recommendations . The article language revised to have good meanings. In recent study we will consider this from the start. We already prepare more recent study for comparison .
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you so much for very valuable comments.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>