

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_110617
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, Attitude and Practices Regarding Tuberculosis among Physicians and Nurses at Al Kuwafiya Specialized Teaching Hospital for Chest and Tuberculosis in Benghazi.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The article covers a pivotal topic of great significance to the community. Since healthcare workers play an important role in managing TB patients, the area of enquiry within the questionnaire, like cough hygiene, personal protection, etc, is relevant.</p> <p>As a suggestion, certain more questions about the healthcare professionals' knowledge about sputum collection techniques, treatment duration, and potential side effects could also have been included.</p> <p>The title is suitable for the study.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but could have been framed better. There are evident grammatical errors, such as in the results paragraph, "On the other hands".</p> <p>Also, many important results are not pointed out in the abstract. Needs revision in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is well structured. All vital subsections are included.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the study's conclusion does not impart any new knowledge. For example, the conclusion that people with more qualifications and work experience will have more knowledge of TB prevention is not a new finding; it is a known fact. So, more innovative aspects could have been explored.</p> <p>Yes, References are sufficient. And most of them are recent studies except a few.</p> <p>I appreciate the effort invested in the manuscript. But I must bring to your attention the presence of gross grammatical errors throughout the study, which needs revision.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. The manuscript is written in an informal way with lots of grammatical errors. I suggest a comprehensive revision of the language.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Febi Ann Roy
Department, University & Country	Sikkim Manipal University of Medical Sciences, India