

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_113634
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Interplay between Mycobacterium tuberculosis (MTB) and Associated Risk Factors: a Population-based Study in Rivers state, Niger Delta Region of Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Given the introduction of authors. It is a great concern in the studied area. So, it is important to find out the risk factors followed by how to manage them to eliminate the disease.</p> <p>It is not bad, however, slightly confusing. The text specially in the discussion part is talking about demographic factors more than risk-factors. So, maybe associated factors might be better than risk-factors.</p> <p>Yes. It highlights the aims of the study. But, I believe non-significant p-values are not necessary in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In the results section all information are presented twice. Once in tables and once as a written form right below the tables. Which is not necessary it is just prolonging the text and complicates it. It is better to choose which information should be presented in what way. For example, the tables with all non-significant factors can be removed and replaced by the written form.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Helia Zare</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Yazd University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>