

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_125321
Title of the Manuscript:	Sputum Culture Contaminants and their Drugs Susceptibility Patterns among TB-suspected Patients at Epicentre Mbarara Research Centre, Uganda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of tuberculosis (TB) management—sputum culture contaminants and drug susceptibility patterns. With the rising global concern over drug-resistant TB, especially in high-burden countries like Uganda, this research provides valuable insights into diagnostic challenges and treatment strategies. The study's focus on drug susceptibility patterns offers practical implications for improving TB treatment outcomes. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance to public health; however, improvements in clarity and structure would enhance its overall impact	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Consider revising the title to more accurately reflect the objectives of the study. Ensure that the title clearly communicates the scope and focus of the research.	
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.	The abstract should provide a concise and informative summary of the most significant aspects of the manuscript. Ensure it covers: Background information and the rationale for the study The justification and significance of the research Specific research objectives A summary of methods used The key findings Conclusions drawn from the results Recommendations for future research or practical applications The abstract should offer a clear snapshot of the entire manuscript, making it easier for readers to grasp the overall study at a glance. Keywords: Select the most essential keywords that encapsulate the main themes of the manuscript. These keywords should closely reflect the study's focus and purpose, particularly those highlighted in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction: Provide a concise yet comprehensive overview of global tuberculosis (TB) data, with an emphasis on the current TB situation in Uganda. Be sure to include details on the prevalence of drug-resistant strains such as multi-drug resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR) TB in the country. Mention the implementation of the Directly Observed Treatment, Short-course (DOTS) program in Uganda, highlighting its impact and	

Review Form 3

	<p>progress. Discuss the phenotypic and genotypic methods employed in Uganda for TB diagnosis, including the use of Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (LAMP) technology, which is significant for rapid detection. Address how sputum culture and drug susceptibility testing are conducted using standardized methods, ensuring the reliability of the results. Clearly outline the study's rationale and justification. Specify the gap this research aims to fill and explicitly state the objectives. Methods: Provide a detailed yet succinct description of the methodology. Avoid overwhelming detail, but ensure all key elements are covered. Consider including a flow chart to visually represent the research process, making it easier for readers to follow. Offer a clear explanation of the statistical analysis used to assess sputum culture contaminants and their drug susceptibility patterns among TB-suspected patients at Epicentre Mbarara Research Centre, Uganda. Present this information in a user-friendly format to avoid confusion. Results: Highlight the most important findings in a clear, engaging manner. Avoid overly complex presentations that could obscure the significance of the results. Use graphs, tables, or other visual aids where appropriate to improve understanding. Discussion: Thoroughly revise the discussion section. Compare the current findings with previously published studies from both Uganda and other parts of the world. Provide logical explanations for the findings, making it easier for readers to interpret the results in the context of existing knowledge. Discuss any limitations of the study, acknowledging potential weaknesses and suggesting ways future research might address them. Conclude the discussion with practical recommendations, focusing on real-world applications rather than theoretical proposals. Highlight potential barriers to implementing these recommendations and suggest strategies for overcoming them. Discuss how the findings contribute to the broader understanding of sputum culture contaminants and drug susceptibility patterns among TB-suspected patients at Epicentre Mbarara Research Centre. Emphasize areas that require further attention for improving TB management and control in Uganda.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it addresses a well-defined problem in tuberculosis (TB) management and uses established methodologies for sputum culture and drug susceptibility testing. The inclusion of both phenotypic and genotypic techniques, such as LAMP, demonstrates the study's adherence to modern diagnostic standards. The statistical analysis employed to interpret the data strengthens the validity of the findings. Overall, the methodology and results are aligned with the study objectives, making the research scientifically credible. However, clearer presentation of results and further elaboration on limitations would enhance the study's comprehensiveness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>Yes. Please reference style of journal</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article requires improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the manuscript conveys the main ideas, certain sections lack clarity and precision, making it difficult for readers to follow the arguments. The phrasing in some parts is overly complex or unclear, which could hinder comprehension. Revising the language to enhance readability, with more concise and accurate expression, would greatly improve its suitability for academic and scientific discourse.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yogendra Shah</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Nepal</p>