

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71094
Title of the Manuscript:	TO STUDY VIT-D IN PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS PATIENTS RECEIVING DOTS
Type of the Article	Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Comments are as follows</p> <p>Titles: Title should be revised again.</p> <p>TO STUDY VIT-D IN PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS PATIENTS RECEIVING DOTS</p> <p>1. Abstract: The maximum word allowed according to Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International is 300. But this manuscript abstract has more than 300 words. Introduction: Too much words with a lot of grammatical error. Introduction is not coherent. Objective of study is not correct. There is missing word. Study design in the abstract is not clearly stated. In addition there is non-standard abbreviations in the abstract. E.g ABVRH and JNMC. Result relevant statistics such as sample sizes, response rates, p- values and etc should be included here.</p> <p>2. Keywords: All keywords are written in abbreviations. Use of abbreviations should be avoided unless they standard abbreviations. There are non standard abbreviations here. E.g PTB, DOTS, VIT-D, WHO, MTB</p> <p>3. Introduction I have seen that each paragraph was taken from single reference. Except paragraph 4 and 5. It should be very good if there is more citation. Background, should be clearly defined problem, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work should be stated. In addition the background should start from broad ideas to specific in order. But here I didn't find the coherence of the sentence please this part should be revised again. Besides there are some grammatical error.</p> <p>4. Material and Method Study design was not clearly stated</p> <p>5. Result and Discussion Results should be clearly described in a concise manner. But in this manuscript I find only single table for the result. In addition the discussion is single paragraph. The result is not even compared with the other studies that have been done before. Two style of referencing system in discussion part. This should be corrected again.</p> <p>6. Reference The order of referencing system is not similar. Please revise it again according to the journal referencing system. E.g</p> <p>1. Ho-Pham L et al. Association between vitamin D insufficiency and tuberculosis in a vietnamese population. BMC Infect Dis. 2010; 10, 306.</p> <p>2. Daniel, V., & Daniel, K. (2020). Exercises training program: It's Effect on Muscle strength and Activity of daily living among elderly people. <i>Nursing and Midwifery</i>, 1(01), 19-23. https://doi.org/10.52845/NM/2020v1i1a5</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

	Spelling and grammatical error Format error	
Optional/General comments	I will not give optional comments because all comments are very important and must be incorporated in the manuscript.	

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:	Ababo Workineh Tadesse
Department, University & Country	Ambo University, Ethiopia