

Paper: “Pre-treatment Loss to Follow-up in Patients with Confirmed Pulmonary Tuberculosis in Niamey, Niger”

Submitted: 24 January 2024

Accepted: 29 March 2024

Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Assiatou Gagara Issoufou Madoudou

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p195](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n12p195)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Minal Kachhawa
SMS Medical College Jaipur, India

Reviewer 2: Adriana Gherbon
University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara, Romania

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Kindly add both Niamey and Tillaberi in the title . Type of study can be added to the title as well.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract effectively summarizes the objectives, methods and results of the study, providing a clear overview of the research conducted and its findings.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

In abstract:

"study conducted over six month (months)"

"Nearly half (42%) of PTLFU had traveled (have traveled) a distance of 6 to 15 km to get the TB screening."

"Conclusion: the(The)"

In methods:

study setting "over six-month (months) period"

"For lost to follow up(follow-up) patients at the time of diagnosis"

Results:

"primary school students accounted for 30% of pre-treatment follow up (follow-up)each."

"In 61% of the cases, pretreatment lost to follow-up without information had unavailable contacts (were unable to contact) ".

Discussion:

"the periods were shortened (the study period was comparatively shorter)."

More than half of those lost to follow-up without information had unavailable contacts (were unable to contact) in 61% of cases."

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Clear information about study design, population, sample size, procedures and ethical clearance is provided.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Discussion : Explain How" Our prevalence is higher than the latter. We can explain this difference by the fact that, our sampling techniques were different."

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Including a brief discussion on potential future research direction could enrich the conclusion and also a better closing statement to specify the objectives.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Its appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Kindly look for grammatic error and do pay special attention on the title

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by th

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate, but in the text must put the refences as the first author name and the year, not numbers. Please correct.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
