

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_120079
Title of the Manuscript:	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.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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)	The manuscript addresses a significant topic in the field of tuberculosis research. The findings contribute to our understanding of Screening Methods and Diagnosis of Overt and Latent TB Infection, which is crucial for improving patient outcomes and advancing medical knowledge. This research is relevant and adds valuable insights to the existing literature.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key objectives, methodologies, results, and conclusions of the study. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of specific quantitative data or major findings to give readers a clearer preview of the study's significance and outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined subsections that facilitate easy navigation through the content. Each section logically flows into the next, ensuring that the reader can follow the progression of the study from introduction to conclusion without difficulty. The use of headings and subheadings is appropriate and aids in organizing the content systematically.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? (Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with robust methodologies and thorough data analysis. The study design is appropriate for addressing the research question, and the statistical methods used are suitable for the type of data collected. The results are presented clearly and are well-supported by the data. The conclusions drawn are logical and consistent with the findings. However, the discussion could benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the implications of the findings and how they compare with existing literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant literature. This provides a strong foundation for the study.	

Review Form 1.8

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are minor grammatical and stylistic errors that need correction to enhance readability and clarity. It may be beneficial to have the manuscript reviewed by a professional editor to ensure that the language quality meets the standards of scholarly writing.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lalitkumar B Patel
Department, University & Country	Narendra Modi Medical College, Gujarat University, India