

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Exploring Sex Differences in Risk Factors and Quality of Life among Tuberculosis Patients in Herat, Afghanistan: A Case-Control Study

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Muhammad Atiq

Submitted on: 16 Nov 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606554

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study has been conducted in the Herat region of Afghanistan on TB patients using a case control design. Education level, wealth status and gender are significant risk factors for a person to be infected with TB.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Main limitation is the absence of an explicit literature review section because of which there arises another limitation; why we need this study (significance of the study) and what did it contribute to (contribution of the study)? Hence, the reviewer is at a loss to understand why this study was needed in the first place. Moreover, policy implications and suggestions are lackluster and require significant thinking and improvement on the part of the authors.

Methodology is the main strength of this paper, very well developed and executed.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

A few corrections are needed:

1. In the introduction section, highlight the significance of the topic more as to why research should be conducted on this topic. What is so special in the context of Afghanistan as a developing country and that too in Herat?
2. Develop a well-structured literature review section, which is critical as well so that gap in existing knowledge can be identified.
3. At the end of the literature review section, again, highlight the significance of the study with the help of world-wide statistics and past research.
4. Policy implications need to be addressed in a manner that they need to be realistic. Keeping in view, the ground realities, especially with the new Government in full control and their orthodox policies.
5. Contribution needs to be highlighted vis-a-vis gap in existing knowledge and the context of the study.

### PLEASE COMMENT

#### **Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

No, the title is inappropriate. The word sex should be replaced with gender.

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes, they are appropriate.

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Requires some proof-reading by a native English speaker.

**Q 7** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

**Q 8** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Actually, a separate and standalone literature review section is missing. So I would suggest the authors to develop it and add some more literature references.

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

**Q 9** Originality

**Q 10** Rigor

**Q 11** Significance to the field

**Q 12** Interest to a general audience

**Q 13** Quality of the writing

**Q 14** Overall scientific quality of the study

**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 15** Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.