



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49949
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Tuberculosis among Children with Severe Acute Malnutrition at Ola During Children's Hospital in Freetown Sierra Leone
Type of the 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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>This is the start of an excellent paper, and I applaud the authors for the excellent work they have done taking care of these very sick children. The paper, as it stands, however, needs a significant amount of work.</p> <p>The biggest challenge with the paper is that it is not clear from the methods how the diagnosis of TB was made in the children. The authors note that there was no bacteriologic confirmation and that a majority of the children did not have radiographic findings of TB. So how then was the TB diagnosis made? Was it based on contact history? Lack of improvement with feeding? Other signs and symptoms? Were children started on empiric therapy and then if they improved was the diagnosis given? This is really a crucial issue and needs to be detailed in the paper. The presence of TB in children on a malnutrition ward is a significant diagnostic dilemma and it is important to know in detail how the diagnosis was made.</p> <p>I am not sure why the authors stopped at 74 participants? Was there a reason for this?</p> <p>The discussion section needs to be expanded. There is a wealth of literature on pediatric TB—especially among children with malnutrition—but the authors seem to be relying on only a few studies. I would suggest they do a broader literature review and try and expand their discussion. They could start with the following references:</p> <p>Jaganath and Mupere. Childhood Tuberculosis and Malnutrition. <i>Journal of Infectious Diseases</i> 2012, 206(12): 1809-15.</p> <p>Chisti MJ, Graham SM, Duke T, Ahmed T, Ashraf H, Faruque ASG, et al. (2014) A Prospective Study of the Prevalence of Tuberculosis and Bacteraemia in Bangladeshi Children with Severe Malnutrition and Pneumonia Including an Evaluation of Xpert MTB/RIF Assay. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 9(4): e93776.</p> <p>Bhat PG, Kumar AMV, Naik B, Satyanarayana S, KG D, Nair SA, et al. (2013) Intensified Tuberculosis Case Finding among Malnourished Children in Nutritional Rehabilitation Centres of Karnataka, India: Missed Opportunities. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 8(12): e84255. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084255</p> <p>I also note that the authors report that both the Xpert and Xray equipment was often non functioning. This is a dilemma many people face in the real world—where there are sick and malnourished children but no way to get some of the supporting diagnostic tests needed to be more confident in making a TB diagnosis. Yet if a diagnosis is not made and treatment initiated, these patients may die. It would really strengthen the paper and make it more applicable if the authors could discuss this dilemma more frankly. Some could see this as a weakness of this cohort, but I view it as a great strength since it reflects the real world conditions. I would suggest the authors talk more about this and how they managed to continue to provide TB care for children under these conditions.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>In the ethics section of the paper, the authors report that there were no ethical issues in the study. But here they should report if an ethics committee reviewed and approved the study. This is a requirement for all studies with human participants and should be explicitly mentioned here.</p> <p>Finally, do the authors have any information on the outcomes of these children? If so, it would strengthen the paper to add it in here. I imagine many of the children got discharged and sent home to complete treatment. But it would be important to discuss this issue (if it happened) and share any outcome data.</p> <p>This paper is such a great start, but I think it needs more expansion and discussion on the issues raised above. I also think the authors need to take this opportunity and talk more about the challenges faced in diagnosing children with TB in this setting as their practical experience would likely benefit many others facing similar situations.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<p>The authors should check the spelling and grammar. Also, there are multiple words that are capitalized that do not need to be (i.e. pediatric).</p> <p>The authors also need to expand the limitations section of the paper. They should consider possible sources of bias in the study and how that might impact the results.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> This study needs to be approved by a human research ethics committee and this needs to be stated in the paper. Given that it was a retrospective cohort study, an exemption is possible, but it did include sensitive health information.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jennifer Furin
Department, University & Country	Harvard Medical School, USA