



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_23239
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of Tuberculosis including Drug-Resistant TB in Private Sector of Mumbai, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Articles

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	- The abstract is not attractive; please use whole numbers and a concise idea to catch the attention of the reader. - Introduction (line 37-45), please review grammar. - Materials and Methods: Please review urgently. It is not clear and does not follow an order. Remember that you have to write this section as a "cooking recipe", so that the reader can reproduce the same study following your instructions. - The "International Standards Section" is part of the introduction or justification of the study, not the Materials and Methods. - Results Section: Remember to write only raw numbers and results of your measures of central-tendency; reserve the interpretation of the results to the Discussion section. - The Conclusion Section shows a very strong argument. Please be more specific with your data to support the statement "Management of TB deviate from international standards of care and are key drivers of DR-TB epidemic".	Abstract revised Statements in introduction reframed ISTC guidelines were used for developing operational definitions; hence they have been mentioned in the methodology section. Results section: interpretation statements were noted in section on 'action taken for patient not responding to first regimen' (Line 240-246) Conclusion: We agree with the reviewer and have deleted the statement - ..and are key drivers of DR-TB epidemic. (Line 414)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Although data was collected until 2012, I recommend to use more recent information from the WHO in the Introduction section.	Thank you for link to article. Data from recent most World TB report has now replaced 2012 data (Line 14-17)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	My strongest recommendation is that you go over this article: Critical Appraisal of Scientific Articles. (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2696241/pdf/Dtsch_Arztebl_Int-106-0100.pdf) This literature with give you a strong guide to write your paper... you already have the data; just needs to be properly organized.	