



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_23001
Title of the Manuscript:	LABORATORY SERVICES AT PRIMARY HEALTH CENTERS UNDER THE LENS: A NEED FOR OVERHAUL
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	Review the ethical issues as elaborated below. Ethical Issue: Was consent obtained from the study participants?? Was the study approved by an IRB? Did the author obtain clearance from local authorities?	The CbMP project is being implemented in the state of Maharashtra along with the Government of Maharashtra. necessary approvals and permissions have been obtained from the Government of Maharashtra for the purpose. Hence, no separate permission was felt necessary for the study. This has been mentioned in the materials and methods section. IRB approval was not felt necessary for this type of study and hence not sought.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 6: Initially write PHC in full, and then subsequently use PHC. Consider organising the abstract as; <i>Background/Objectives</i> <i>Methods</i> <i>Results</i> <i>Conclusions</i> Add how data was analysed in the abstract. Line 13: 12 (9.7%) change it to 9.7% (n=12), This is more captivating. Consider doing this for the rest of the numerical reports.	Done. Abstract organised as suggested. Done. Application of Chi-square test mentioned. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 15: 67.7% (n= 42), consider using percentages first and then absolute numbers in the brackets as illustrated here. Line 20: Key words - Laboratory, Services, Status, Primary Health Center, Rural <i>are better in illustrating what this study is about, consider using these.</i> Table: Microscope availability in Non PHC ; 93.6% (n=58) NOT 93.5%. Line 26: ailments. [1] Should be ailments [1]. i.e note the position of the full stop. It should enclose the reference in brackets eg [5] belongs to the statement 2012 [5]. In line 66. Line 46: SATHI in full??? Line 48: NGOs in full??? Line 82: Look at an example of the table below and consider reviewing the text table to what is illustrated here. It is on the last page. Line 106: Use uniform digits e.g 38.16% should be 38.2%.,,; Is [RHS 2015 table 22] a reference to??? Line 141: [1] Jan Swasthya Sahayog. Impressions [2] Dacombe, RJ, Squire SB, Ramsay..... Consider using these brackets (put the reference numbers in brackets) throughout the references as illustrated here. Line 157: This Reference 7 is not part of the text. Consider deleting it or review where it is needed in the text.	Not done for this part as absolute numbers are not quoted. Key words amended. Done. Done. Full form mentioned. Full form mentioned. Table contents modified as suggested. This was an erroneous quote and is deleted. Done as suggested. Deleted.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study is so informative and depicts what is on the ground in the primary health care setting. It is a great piece.	
---	--	--

Example of the Table:

Table 1: Status of Laboratory Services in Tribal and Non-Tribal PHCs

Parameters of a Functional Laboratory at PHC	Availability			P value
	Tribal PHCs (61) % (n)	Non-Tribal PHCs (62) % (n)	Overall Total (123) % (n)	
<i>Lab technician</i>	91.8 (n = 56)	67.7 (n = 2)	79.7 (n = 98)	0.0009*

Source: Primary Data

*significant