



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_32801
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial and Fungal Contaminants in <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> Cultures at National Tuberculosis Referral Laboratory-Kampala
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The slide culture technique for the fungi on page 3 paragraph 1 is not clear and should be clarified or expounded.	Clarification has been made
Minor REVISION comments	1. Sample size determination is misplaced and should come earlier just after study site. Also indicate the prevalence use is for what pathogen? Clarify 2. The results (graph) can best be illustrated using a professional table. 3. 72 hour incubation for fungi may not have been adequate for detection of all possible fungal pathogens as some fungi requires prolonged incubation periods. 4. In the discussion the use of the term breakthrough may not be appropriate. 5. Check and correct all the typos and font types/sizes	Changes have been made as recommended. The authors had both table and the graph and recommended to use the graph for easy interpretation during the first evaluation. Clarification has been made. Observation for 72 hours was applicable for yeasts only and three weeks for possible filamentous fungal growth. The term Breakthrough has been deleted as recommended A spelling and grammar check has been performed to eliminate typos. Uniform font size now used throughout the text
Optional/General comments	In the conclusion; The author should consider highlighting the significance of the isolated contaminants as the possible causative agents of infection/co-infections in TB and should recommend investigations into the significance of isolating <i>Aspergillus fumigatus</i> and Staphylococcus and Klebsiella. It should not always be treated as culture contaminants as this have been incriminated in pulmonary infections that mimics TB.	Changes have been made in accordance to the reviewer's advice.