

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRID_127420 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EXTRAPULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS AT THE SYLVANUS OLYMPIO UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL CENTER |
| Type of the Article | Retrospective Descriptive Study |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it provides insights into the epidemiology, diagnosis, and management of extrapulmonary tuberculosis (EPTB) in a resource-limited setting, which is under-represented in global research. It highlights the challenges of presumptive diagnosis and the impact of HIV on disease progression, offering a basis for improving healthcare strategies in sub-Saharan Africa. The study also emphasizes the need for better diagnostic tools and healthcare infrastructure, which are critical for addressing tuberculosis globally.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The current title, "Extrapulmonary Tuberculosis at the Sylvanus Olympio University Hospital Center", is suitable. However, a more descriptive alternative could be: "Epidemiology and Management of Extrapulmonary Tuberculosis: A Study at Sylvanus Olympio University Hospital Center, Togo."</p> | |
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from more clarity and brevity. Suggestions: 1. Add the statistical significance of key findings (e.g., HIV association with outcomes). 2. Streamline repetitive phrases and focus on essential details like primary diagnostic challenges and mortality rates.</p> | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p>The manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting clinically relevant data and valid conclusions based on the findings. The use of clear inclusion/exclusion criteria and comparison with international literature enhances its credibility. However, the over-reliance on presumptive diagnoses highlights the need for better diagnostic facilities.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The references are sufficient and include recent sources. Adding more on the cost-effectiveness and accessibility of diagnostic tools like GeneXpert in sub-Saharan Africa could strengthen the discussion.</p> | |
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Recommendations for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand the dataset by including more cases or extending the study period for a more robust analysis. 2. Emphasize the challenges and opportunities of improving diagnostic certainty in resource-limited settings, with specific suggestions for implementation. 3. Strengthen the statistical analysis section with detailed explanations of methods and thresholds. 4. Edit the manuscript for language consistency and grammatical accuracy to enhance readability. 5. Streamline the presentation of data to avoid redundancy and improve clarity. 6. Discuss broader implications of findings, such as the impact on public health policy and tuberculosis control programs in Togo and similar regions. 7. Improve language and grammar for readability. 8. Consolidate redundant data and streamline tables. 9. Importantly, provide more detail on statistical methods and significance. | |

Review Form 3

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: | Santhosh Kumar Rajamani |
| Department, University & Country | MIMER Medical College, India |