

Paper: “Tuberculosis in Vaccinated versus Unvaccinated Children with BCG Vaccine in Niamey: Epidemiological, Diagnostic and Outcome Aspects”

Submitted: 23 August 2022

Accepted: 21 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Samaila Aboubacar

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p16](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p16)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stephen Kariuki, Mount Kenya University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Elza Nikoleishvili

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Stephen Mwaura Kariuki	
University/Country: Mount Kenya University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/10/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 4/11/2022
Manuscript Title: Tuberculosis in Vaccinated Versus Unvaccinated Children with BCG Vaccine in Niamey: Epidemiological, Diagnostic and Outcome Aspects	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0925/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Everything is okay here</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>Okay, but the conclusion fail to clearly connect with the main objective in a statistically backed manner</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p><i>There are a few grammatical errors, but which can change the meaning of some statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For instance, in the abstract the statement “The study population consisted exhaustively of children aged 0 to 15 years old” – I suggest replacement of the word ‘exhaustively’ with “exclusively” - Another case of grammatical is in this statement in the conclusion section: “This study shows that children’s BCG vaccination status interferes with some aspects of tuberculosis” the word “interferes” should be replaced with the word ‘correlates’ 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methods are sufficiently explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p><i>There are some results that are not clear. For instance, the authors reported “Sputum or gastric fluid microscopic examination was done in 54.9% of patients. It was positive in 13.2% of vaccinated children versus 2.2% of unvaccinated children (OR=4.53; CI [1.05-31.70], p=0.02)”.</i></p> <p><i>It’s not clear even in the discussion section whether the authors imply that there is a greater risk of tuberculosis among the vaccinated relative to the unvaccinated given these statistics reported here that show significantly higher positivity of the disease based on microscopy among the vaccinated than in the unvaccinated group</i></p> <p><i>The discussion section does not have a logical flow of thoughts. In some cases it looks like a list of references just appearing as consistent or inconsistent with this study. There is need to construct a discussion that shows a clear relationship between this study and other studies in a composition that has a logical flow</i></p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The conclusion segment does not capture the conclude on the main objective which was “to study impact of BCG vaccination on morbidity and mortality related to childhood tuberculosis in Niamey”</i> – <i>The conclusion should clearly state what the impact was, backed by the statistical analysis that was done and not a sweeping statement of some form of correlation or not</i> 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are okay and they are wideranging</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors need to ensure that every finding and their statistical outcomes are well explained especially where they deviate from the usual conceptions – like in the case of more positive cases of TB in the vaccinated group than in the unvaccinated group. You may want to check whether the sputum microscopy was okay

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is good if the issues can be addressed