| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent  [ ] Grade B: Very good  [ Y] Grade C: Good  [ ] Grade D: Fair  [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| Language quality | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing  [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing  [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [ ] Accept (High priority)  [ ] Accept (General priority)  [ ] Minor revision  [ Y] Major revision  [ ] Rejection |

| Re-review | [ Y] Yes   [   ] No |
|---|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is interesting review about the current and future of Tuberculosis, however, the authors wrote this review uncarefully, some major revisions need to be addressed as below:   1. Format of this review should be reconstructed to make the review clearer.   2. Header of manuscript should be added or revised to be easily observed. And the paragraphs in each header should be rewritten to focus on the title of header. 3. Abstract is too long, should be in 250-350 words only and focused on the main purpose of this review. 4. Abbreviations should be written after full words. Please check all manuscript carefully. For example, in abstract section, MDR and XDR TB in 1st sentence? 5. The authors mentioned about vitamin D for treatment, but the paragraph about vitamin D is in diagnosis section? Please recheck all manuscript and revise it carefully. 6. Although there are too many techniques of diagnosis or molecular imaging, artificial intelligence, quantum computing; there is no any figure that illustrates the techniques or summarizes the diagnostic technique, the future approach of AI,……. I recommend the authors to add some figures of each section to make the manuscript more interesting and observable. 7. What field of Tuberculosis do the authors focus to discuss? The manuscript was written in too broad area but not deep discussion. All manuscript must be rearranged and rewrote based on the manuscript title as "TUBERCULOSIS CONUNDRUM - Current and Future Scenarios - New proposed comprehensive approach & Molecular Imaging, Artificial Intelligence, Quantum Computing perspectives". Where is the perspective of "New proposed comprehensive approach & Molecular Imaging, Artificial Intelligence, Quantum Computing"? 8. Scientific writing

must be improved.

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Radiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 75148

**Title:** THE TUBERCULOSIS CONUNDRUM - Current and Future Scenarios: A proposed comprehensive approach combining Laboratory, Imaging, and Computing Advances

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05458177

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Indonesia

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-07 05:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-07 05:40

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [ Y] Grade C: Good [  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| **Language quality** | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [  ] Accept (General priority) [  ] Minor revision    [ Y] Major revision    [  ] Rejection |

| Re-review | [  ] Yes   [ Y] No |
|---|---|
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please adjust the manuscript to the author guidelines : https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/192  This manuscript is way too long. The main text would be better 1500-2000 words for a minireview.

| Scientific quality | [ Y] Grade A: Excellent  [  ] Grade B: Very good  [  ] Grade C: Good  [  ] Grade D: Fair  [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| **Language quality** | [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing  [  ] Grade B: Minor language polishing  [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)  [ Y] Accept (General priority)  [  ] Minor revision  [  ] Major revision  [  ] Rejection |

| Re-review | [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |
|---|---|
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript The article is extremely interesting .

# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Radiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 75148

**Title:** Tuberculosis conundrum - current and future scenarios: A proposed comprehensive approach combining laboratory, imaging, and computing advances

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05458177

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Indonesia

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-22 06:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-22 07:04

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent [ Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| Language quality | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous |

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [    ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author had been addressed the comments well.