

**Review Form 1.8**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_120079</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Evaluation of Three Screening Methods (Conventional, Molecular and Immunological) in the Diagnosis of Overt and Latent TB Infection in Mixed Population in Cross River State.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.8**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	<b>A scientific research on Comparative Evaluation of Three Screening Methods (Conventional, Molecular and Immunological) in the Diagnosis of Overt and Latent TB Infection in Mixed Population in Cross River State. screening methods seems very important to participate in the development of techniques for detecting new cases and more precisely their resistance</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)	- "Comparative Evaluation of Screening Methods in the Diagnosis of Overt and Latent TB Infection in Mixed Population in Cross River State." - Add the year of scientific study	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>	yes the summary is well written but it is necessary to deepen the research methodology, add the research period, as well as previous figures	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	yes the structure is good, we respect the IMRAD method	
<b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	the scientific study concerns the screening techniques and methods as well as their effectiveness, the article includes correct techniques and the comparison of the results was well established for this I suppose that scientifically the article is well designed	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	unfortunately, for the references are not recent, it is preferable to add more recent references	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	review the writing style especially the discussion part	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Standardize the bibliography (see journal conditions) APA exp:12. And 1; eliminate "from" at the beginning of the reference</li> <li>- in my opinion we must try to give justifications and explanations in relation to the results found for example for the male sex and the most affected</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.8**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Badreddine Dahou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Ibn Tofail Kenitra, Morocco</b>