



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_23447
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNITY TUBERCULOSIS CARE IN NIGERIA: A CALL FOR ACTION
Type of the Article	Review papers

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
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is a paper on an interesting and important topic. In order to be acceptable for publication, serious restructuring and revision of the manuscript is necessary. The authors need to decide the focus of article. Is it to identify the need for CBC and barriers to its implementation? Is it to present the general situation of TB and DR-TB in Nigeria and talk about what is needed? I think the former would allow for a more targeted paper to be written. The authors should develop a clear and concise background with no more than 3-4 paragraphs. The background should talk about the burden of disease in Nigeria, including the data from the recent WHO reports, and describe the current situation of TB care in the country. Finally, there should be a paragraph noting that community-based TB services have been successful in other settings and cite that work (including the work the authors describe in Nigeria). The authors could then state that this paper will review some of the specific challenges to TB care in Nigeria and discuss how they can be addressed through CBC. There should be a methods section. It is unclear how the authors obtained some of the data that is in here and how this data was used to draw the conclusions they did. Was it via a review of the literature, including internal documents on TB control in Nigeria? Were people interviewed? The reader needs to be reassured that the	I definitely agree on the issues raised by the Reviewer and the amendments have been made and same attached in this mail. I have made the work to focus on identification of the need for CTBC and the barrier to its implementation. 4 paragraphs were utilized in the Introduction and Background. These paragraphs focused on the burden of the disease in Nigeria, including the data from different reports and the need for CTBC raised while the focus of the paper was stated in the last paragraph. This was followed by the Methods section where the approach to the review was discussed. The Third Section is the Findings Section that looked into various issues relating to TB and CBTC in Nigeria. It was concluded by the Barriers to Optimal TB Care in Nigeria and how to Surmount them using CTBC. This was followed by the Recommendation which contains points on the actions to be taken as far as CTBC is concerned that will in turn reduce TB burden in the country.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	information presented in the paper is valid, and knowing the methods would help. On the other hand, if the authors want to present this as a “position paper” or a “viewpoints” paper, then that would be reasonable, but the article should then be structured in that way. The findings of the paper should be presented in a more structured way. It could start with listing and describing the barriers to optimal TB care in Nigeria, and the authors have some nice information on this topic. The findings can then go on describe how CBC can address these barriers. Finally, the findings could then go on to talk about barriers to CBC and how these could be overcome. AS it is written now, this section of the paper, while interesting, is not organized enough for the reader to follow. Finally, there should be a conclusion and next steps section.. The authors title this paper as a “call to action” but what are the specific actions that could be taken based on the findings of this paper? What are the limitations of this paper? This manuscript has the potential to be a great paper, but it will need to be rewritten extensively with a more targeted focus and concise and orderly presentation of the methods, findings, conclusion, and next steps.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The situation in Nigeria is indeed alarming, and concerted action is needed to address the serious problems there. While I share the authors sense of urgency around this, there are far too many ! in the text. This is a scholarly piece of work into which the authors have put a great deal of time. Presenting the data in a concise fashion that is more consistent with an academic piece of work will help the conclusions of the paper be taken more seriously.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		