Peer Review Report

Review Report on Assessment of family Tuberculosis contact screening practice and its associated factors among Pulmonary Tuberculosis positive patients in South Wollo Zone, Amhara region, Ethiopia

Original Article, Int J Public Health

EVALUATION

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

The article aimed to assess the prevalence and the associated factors of family contact screening practice in their study area. The prevalence of family contact screening was 55.3%, (CI: 60, 50). Having family support for care and treatment (AOR=2.21, 95% CI: 1.16, 4.21), waiting time less than 60 minutes (AOR=2.03, 95% CI: 1.28, 3.21), took health education on TB prevention and treatment (AOR=1.86), 95% CI: 1.05, 3.29), and having good knowledge about TB prevention (AOR=2.76, 95% CI: 1.77, 4.294) were factors associated with family TB contact screening practice.

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

The prevalence of family contact screening in the study area was low as compared to the national and the WHO target in which all index cases were expected to screen their families. Factors associated with family contact screening in this study were family support, waiting time, health education offered by health care workers, and level of knowledge of the index cases. Hence, advocating the cases to disclose their status to their family or caregivers, enhancing service provision quality by minimizing waiting time, practicing health education about tuberculosis prevention and control strategies in the primary health care service would be important strategies to increase family contact screening utilization. Further research should be conducted to evaluate why the current routine community surveillance system regarding family contact screening practices in the national tuberculosis control program
308 failed to achieve the national target.

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.**

The article aimed to assess the prevalence and the associated factors of family contact screening practice in their study area. It is nicely written manuscript. It explored a area which is focused on prevention of the disease.

In abstract conclusion is missing.

Avoid 2-3 paragraph sentences. Club sentences logically in paragraphs.

Add monthly income units (i.e. USD) in table 1

In Table 3 p-values are not required as from CI significance can be seen.

Report R2, HL and PAR for regression model

Add a pargraph on what this study adds and future research scopes in the topic

PLEASE COMMENT

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

Yes

Q 5   **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes

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

Yes

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?)**

Yes

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:**

Minor revisions.