

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_118278
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF TRUENAT WITH GeneXpert FOR DETECTION OF TUBERCULAR MENINGITIS IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS
Type of the Article	Original

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, This manuscript is essential for the dissemination, validation, and progression of scientific knowledge.</p> <p>Its ok, but I suggested it could be “Evaluation of novel chip based test TRUENAT Compared to traditional GeneXpert for Detecting Tubercular Meningitis”.</p> <p>Replace all short forms (e.g. CSF, WHO etc) for better understanding in abstract, more elaborate the result section. What is the scientific result of this study which dramatically change the diagnostic accuracy?. Mention setting of this study. Arrange keyword in alphabetical order.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate.</p> <p>Add exclusion criteria. Discuss the sensitivity and specificity of both test. mention ethical approval and patient consent in the methodology section. Discuss role of both test in adult population as well.</p> <p>Add more recent references at least 50% from the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Need to amend abstract.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Madeeha Shahid
Department, University & Country	Fazaia Ruth Pfau Medical College, Pakistan