

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_85773
Title of the Manuscript:	NON-TUBERCULOUS MYCOBACTERIA INFECTION AMONG PEOPLE WITH HIV IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The authors have studied the prevalence of NTM among HIV patients in Rivers State, Nigeria, by standard methods and an improved technique, viz., Line Probe Assay.</p> <p>1. Although Line Probe Assay is included as one of the key words, there is no mention about this test parameter in the Abstract.</p> <p>2. One figure of LPA showing positive and negative results may be included.</p> <p>3. Whether the sputum samples were concentrated by Petroff's method etc? If not done, this should be mentioned as a Limitation of the study. Similarly, the authors may include that automation was not used for isolation (MGIT/BACTEC etc.).</p> <p>4. Table-2 needs modification and clarity. Should give details of how many sputum samples were positive for culture only/positive for LPA only/positive for both culture &amp; LPA.</p> <p>5. What are the species of NTM isolated and to which Runyon's group they belong?</p> <p>6. There is no mention about the result of drug sensitivity for MTB and NTM isolates.</p> <p>7. Discussion should also include the Stage of HIV of those patients who were positive for NTM sputum cultures?</p> <p>8. Among NTM positive patients, any co-infection with MTB?</p>	<p>Revisions as suggested by the reviewer has been carried out. the revisions for the abstract have been made appropriately. Study Limitations have been added as suggested by reviewer. Table 2 has been modified with better clarity. The NTM isolated were not speciated as indicated in the limitation of the study. There was no coinfection of MTB among persons infected with NTM.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	