

Peer Review

Review of: "Prevalence, Patterns, and Correlates of Depression Among Drug-Susceptible Tuberculosis Patient Enrollees in Ogbomoso, Oyo State: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Tariku Mengesha¹

1. Non communicable disease division, Armauer Hansen Research Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Comments from reviewers

I appreciate the work you and your team did; you are doing great work, and congrats for that. I just want to add some questions and comments which will make the paper more acceptable and visible to those researchers who want to read it. Here below are some of my comments:

1. You do not present the list of variables fitted in the bivariate binary logistics regression within the abstract; it is only needed within the body of the manuscript, not in the abstract part.
2. On the conclusion part of the abstract, you do not restate the result; rather, you conclude based on the findings you got.
3. On the methods section on eligibility criteria, why do you want to exclude mentally incapable participants while you are going to assess one of the mental health problems? So, do you not think it will bias your conclusion? Justify it.
4. On the data analysis sub-section:
 - It is better to separate the data collection methods and data analysis into two different paragraphs so that it will be easy to understand.
 - Did you not use mean, frequency, and percentage on descriptive analysis? So mention it here.
 - What was the cut point of the p-value from bivariable to multivariable binary logistics regression analysis?

- Did you check the model fitness and collinearity test and mention the value of each in the result part?
1. On the socio-demographic part of the results:
 - Add the mean and standard deviation and minimum and maximum of the age of the participants before mentioning the age group frequency within the paragraph, not within the table.
 - Also, add the variables such as occupation and others with the prevalent group frequency.
 1. Your inferential statistics table should be concise and more informative by explaining and presenting the most important and pertinent information; and also justify why you want to present two different inferential statistics, ANOVA and binary logistics regressions, at the same time while one has stronger evidence than the other.
 2. Mention the 95% CI interval of the outcome prevalence, and use it to compare your results with other literature findings.
 3. On the discussion part, it is better to address and discuss each finding in a single paragraph so that you can explain the possible reason for that.
 4. On the abbreviations, how about the other remaining abbreviations like PHQ and confirm others?
 5. Add the letter number of the study on the ethical approval subsection.
 6. Cross-check the overall grammar and flow of presentation, especially in the methods and results parts, and stick with the journal guidelines.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.