



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_BJMMR_25347 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Radiologic pattern of sputum-positive Pulmonary Tuberculosis (PTB) among immunocompetent patients in Gwagwalada, Nigeria. |
| 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 | <p>The manuscript needs to be grammatically scrutinised.</p> <p>Abstract is deficient in all subheadings, especially with Background and Conclusion.</p> <p>Introduction does not have robust literature search on local and international studies.</p> <p>Methodology has some deficiencies; No mention of study period, Ethical approval, patient/subject consent, equipment type and manufacturer's details.</p> <p>No mention of details of sputum collection/analysis.</p> <p>Apart from frequencies and percentages, no results of other statistical analysis mentioned in the methodology are provided,</p> <p>Discussion is not robust enough.</p> <p>References are not cited the Vancouver style. More than six authors are listed in some.</p> | <p>The abstract will be adjusted but will avoid a long abstract</p> <p>The objective of the study was radiological for all patients with ready sputum AFB result</p> <p>Will state ethical approval</p> <p>Will adjust discussion</p> <p>Will correct the Vancouver style</p> |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <p>The first two sentences under CONCLUSION are appropriate as recommendations. Please state what your study has found.</p> | <p>Thanks for the comment sir</p> |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>Please see the tracked comments on the article file as attached.</p> | <p>Tracked comments viewed sir</p> |