Reviewer's report

Title: Hemoptysis, a developing world perspective.

Version: 2 Date: 7 December 2005

Reviewer: Joanna Moschandreas

Reviewer's report:

General
It is not clear that the data analysis methods presented are actually appropriate for the proposed study. Please see my detailed comments below.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. “…outcome of different treatment modalities like surgery and embolization will be compared using student’s t test”. The measurement(s) of interest needs to be specified. If survival is of interest, the t-test is clearly inappropriate. Also, it seems likely that univariate analyses will not be appropriate e.g. the analyses should account for possible age differences between the groups being compared.
2. The positive predictive value (PPV) has not been correctly defined. The correct definition is “the positive predictive value is the probability that a person has the condition, given that they test positive”. The definition of the negative predictive value (NPV) is also incorrect.
3. Following on from 2, it is not clear
   a) which “condition” will be tested for amongst these hemoptysis patients.
   b) which diagnostic tests will be assessed.
   The author needs to specify both the tests and the outcomes being tested for.
4. The PPV and NPV are affected by the prevalence of the condition. An estimate of the prevalence should therefore be given.
5. It would appear that the main aim is to investigate the contribution of various etiologic agents to hemoptysis presentation in this developing country. If so this, and the secondary aims, need to be clearly stated as such and appropriate statistical hypotheses formed.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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