



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_38283
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Pulmonary Mycoses among HIV infected clients attending anti-retroviral therapy clinic at Kisoro district Hospital, Western Uganda.
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	1) Sampling: Authors have failed to mention Sample size determination, Inclusion and exclusion Criteria. On what Basis they enrolled the patients. 2) Figure 1: It is better to represent Percentages Via Pie chart. Figure 1 needs to be changed. 3) Table 1: Authors have failed to mention foot notes. 4) Demographic details of the patients are missing; It would have been wise if authors mention about the demographic details of the patients enrolled, so that demographic attributes of the diseases could have been determined. 5) As the authors have estimated Prevalence, they have not mentioned about the confidence intervals.	We really apologize for this. In the edited version, the sample size, exclusion and inclusion criteria ha Figure 1 has been changed to a pie chart and percentages have been included. Thank you Table 1, the abbreviations used have been defined. The demographic details of the patients are missing. We do admit this big mistake, unfortunately it started with tool that we used to capture our data. While we recognize how important this would impact on our paper, we regrettably missed them out. Thank you though for pointing it out clearly. Under results, we gave a prevalence of 34/252 (13.49%; 95% Confidence Interval=9.53-18.34). we had initially indicated it as 95% CI, probably that is why you could not see it, but in this revised paper we have written it in full. The 95% CI is well indicated. Thank you for all your valuable comments, they have really improved our paper.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		