

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_111518
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF GENEXPERT MTB/RIF TECHNOLOGY ON THE MINIMIZATION OF TUBERCULOSIS: A REVIEW LITERATURE
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript provides a valuable review of GeneXpert technology and its potential impact on tuberculosis diagnosis and management. Tuberculosis remains a major global health problem and improved diagnostics are critical to reducing disease burden. The review summarizes key information on the development, features, and real-world implementation of GeneXpert. It would be strengthened by a more comprehensive evaluation of evidence on its effects on case finding, time to diagnosis/treatment, treatment outcomes, etc. Overall, this review makes a useful contribution to the scientific literature on new diagnostics for this deadly infection. 2. The title "The Impact of GeneXpert MTB/RIF Technology on the Minimization of Tuberculosis: A Review Literature" is appropriate and captures the focus of the review. However, consider revising to "The Impact of GeneXpert MTB/RIF Technology on Tuberculosis Diagnosis and Management: A Review" to more specifically convey the content. 3. The abstract provides a suitable summary of the main sections of the paper. I would suggest adding 1-2 sentences summarizing the key findings on GeneXpert's impact from the main text. 4. The structure using subsections for Introduction, Tuberculosis Epidemic, Pathogenesis, History, Management in Ghana, GeneXpert Technology, Evaluation, and Conclusion is logical and easy to follow. The GeneXpert section is very thorough. Consider expanding the Evaluation section to add more depth on evidence of GeneXpert's effects. 5. The review appears scientifically sound overall. The background sections establish context well. The GeneXpert section comprehensively describes the technology's development and features. The evaluation of its impact would benefit from citing more direct evidence and studies quantifying its effects versus standard diagnostics. 6. The article includes relevant references, including key WHO guidelines and research studies. The references appear sufficiently current, with most sources published in the last 5-10 years. Some additional references could help strengthen the Evaluation section by citing studies and data on GeneXpert's impact on diagnosis rates, time to treatment, patient outcomes, etc. <p>Overall Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The review provides a good overview of tuberculosis, its history, and current management approaches. The section on GeneXpert technology is quite thorough. However, the evaluation of GeneXpert's impact is lacking in depth. • The introduction effectively sets the stage on the global TB epidemic. The sections on pathogenesis, history, and management in Ghana establish useful context. • The authors comprehensively describe the development, validation, and implementation of GeneXpert technology. The discussion of its features, WHO recommendations, and real-world utilization is informative. • However, the evaluation of GeneXpert's impact is cursory and lacks substantive evidence on its effects on case finding, time to diagnosis/treatment, treatment outcomes, etc. This critical section needs expansion. • More detail is needed on GeneXpert's limitations and challenges, such as cost, infrastructure needs, user errors, and applicability in certain settings. • The conclusion is very brief. More summary on the technology's benefits but need for health system strengthening would be helpful. <p>Specific Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Abstract, summarize the key findings on GeneXpert's impact from the main text. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the Introduction, provide more statistics on the disease burden and gaps in diagnosis/treatment. Establish the need for improved diagnostics.• In the GeneXpert Technology section, cite real-world evidence on the sensitivity/specificity, user-friendliness, and other features in practice.• In the Evaluation section, systematically synthesize studies on GeneXpert's effects on diagnosis rates, time to treatment, treatment outcomes, drug resistance detection, etc. Consider meta-analyses.• In the Evaluation, also comment on cost-effectiveness, infrastructure requirements, equity of access, and user proficiency issues with GeneXpert.• In the Conclusion, directly restate the key findings and needs going forward instead of broader discussion on TB control.• Carefully proofread for typos, grammar, formatting. Double check citations.• Consider adding a Table compiling key studies on GeneXpert impact. Or a Figure showing TB diagnostics algorithm with and without GeneXpert.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yogesh M
Department, University & Country	Shri MP Shah Medical College, India