

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_78166
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Outcome of Tuberculosis Case Surveillance at Kano Central Correctional Center, North-west Nigeria: A Need for Routine Active Case Findings for TB in Nigerian Correctional Centers.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>I found the article well-written and cohesive. I was happy to read about the results and conclusions and am glad to recommend this for publication after only some minor revisions.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Title and abstract</b>	The title is very informative and some errors were detected in the abstract, such as the summary has more than 300 words such as the magazine rules, the type of study carried out is missing, no statistical tests applied in the student are indicated and I consider the objective of the same	
<b>Introduction</b> (Is the problem / objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The somewhat comprehensive, well-founded and up-to-date introduction, which provided important information more than 50% of the references are out of date, all are over 5 years old and do not appear as indicated in the magazine's guidelines.	
<b>Materials &amp; methods</b> (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	In this section the type of study was omitted and the sample was not defined, excluding that detail, I believe that this section was duly elaborated.	
<b>Results &amp; discussion</b> (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1. The data seem solid and give a very serious view of the results of the Outcome of Tuberculosis Case Surveillance at Kano Central Correctional Center, North-west Nigeria: A Need for Routine Active Case Findings for TB in Nigerian Correctional Centers., therefore, I think it should be available and be known by the entire medical community for its extension. 2. The discussion is well structured. I consider that the discussion focused more on exposing the results than making a comparison with other similar studies carried out, which is the objective of the discussion in the research work, which I consider should be reviewed. 3. The tables are given the title above and	

**Review Form 1.6**

	must have the source from which the data presented in them was extracted and a legend if necessary to correctly interpret the abbreviations	
<b>Conclusion</b> (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	The conclusions section is correct and based on the results obtained during the research, as well as being very explicit and informative for the rest of the international medical community.	
<b>References</b> : Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The bibliographies are limited according to the order of appearance, there are some (25) that are not limited, more than 50% are outdated, are more than 5 years old and not all of them are limited according to Vancouver international standards.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Carlos Antonio Sánchez Portela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Medical Sciences of Pinar of Río, Cuba</b>