

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_112226
Title of the Manuscript:	Tuberculosis: Interdisciplinary view and representation using Artificial Intelligence
Type of the 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. The manuscript has been aimed to find out a suitable theme to proceed in a classroom. The methodology that has been employed is already established in the field of research methodology.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. No.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p> <p>Suggestion of additional references: Varlamov OO, Chuvikov DA, Adamova LE, Petrov MA, Zabolotskaya IK, Zhilina TN. Logical, philosophical and ethical aspects of AI in medicine. International Journal of Machine Learning and Computing. 2019 Dec;9(6):868.</p> <p>Holstein K, McLaren BM, Alevin V. Student learning benefits of a mixed-reality teacher awareness tool in AI-enhanced classrooms. In Artificial Intelligence in Education: 19th International Conference, AIED 2018, London, UK, June 27–30, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 19 2018 (pp. 154-168). Springer International Publishing.</p> <p>Winkler R, Roos J. Bringing AI into the classroom: Designing smart personal assistants as learning tutors.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>a) What did you mean by concept? Please clarify. There are already established strategies for selecting concepts and to justify the strength of the concept would require a different technique. Spider web cannot justify the strength of a concept that should be explored.</p> <p>b) What did you mean by non-experimental?</p> <p>c) Spider web is an interactive technique that is considered to detect parameters/variables of choice of the time to evaluate a particular concept. Employing spider web in multidisciplinary approach was a wrong technique. Thus, this study ended with a defuse result.</p> <p>d) According to me: spider web is an interactive technique that is like throwing dice to show that data were selected by the participant was not biased.</p> <p>e) Significance of adding a variable 'race' should be clarified to avoid misinterpretation among the readers.</p> <p>f) Bases of considering concepts will be required to justify the model.</p> <p>g) Did you mean "series of logical algorithm"?</p> <p>h) Data that had been presented, failed to maintain 30-word-limits. Thus, the quality of data that had been presented was under questioned and that could be summarized as understating level of the selected students. That must be an important parameter how to strengthen the teacher student relationship to get the most out of the limitations.</p> <p>i) Why is the 30 words limitation appropriate?</p> <p>j) "Concepts that surprised" section is the major drawback of the model to select variables/parameters. How did the model overcome this obstacle? Please clarify.</p> <p>k) Name the diagram (spider web). Please revise the diagram for clear visibility.</p> <p>l) How did you test the significant? Was the test for significance included in the spider web technique? If not, researcher would require exploring additional technique(s) to spider web, to get the full picture?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>m) Data from AI were also exceeded 20-words-limit of the study, which raised credibility of inclusion of AI in medicine. In that case inclusion of AI in research methodology could be restricted to image production. This study may give a second thought regarding inclusion of AI in medicine.</p> <p>n) How the randomness had been controlled while selecting the most relevant one? How did they analyse data? Please clarify.</p> <p>o) Was the study meant to explore the scope of spider web technique in the classroom to get more interactive participation from different disciplines? The concluding remarks could not be related with the title of the article and the aim of the study. The concluding remarks would require a revision.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tania Bulbul
Department, University & Country	Center for Communicable Diseases, International Center for Diarrheal Disease Research, Bangladesh