Review of: "Scout TB: An AI Robot for the Screening of Tuberculosis Among Prisoners – A Novel Technique"

Mohammad Javad Shaibani[1]

1 Tehran University of Medical Sciences

This article introduces a novel idea for detecting TB diseases in prisons. In my opinion, this article is fit for a magazine instead of an academic journal. Regarding the article, the following issues may help the authors to improve their work:

• I think the title should be modified: we do not see a technique in the article. Instead, a novel idea is described. So "a novel technique" should be "a novel idea". Also, the title seems to be long.

• I think some keywords such as "cost" and "robot" are very general and should be altered.

• I think a better heading should be used for the problem statement. The current heading is "Scout TB Robot as Health Inspector at Prisons to Improve Health Care for Prisoners", which is very long.

• More references should be used in the article.

• Is Scout TB a decision support system? How much autonomy does it have? What is the role of health-care professionals in managing the system?

• In the article, some parts need to be edited: in "Benefits of Scout TB Robot"-Accuracy"

• Please explain the screening tests and samples that are needed? How can they be collected? How are X-ray images prepared for the robot in a prison environment?

• In case of cost-effectiveness, how can it be alleged without comparing both costs and effects with the next best alternative intervention, such as the TB vaccine? Why should, in prisons, the vaccine not be injected instead of implementing a costly AI robot?

• This section seems to be redundant: "How can the health inspector robot improve healthcare services in prisons and quarantine areas? … in these environments.""

• Please explain on what basis the costs are calculated. How do we compare the labor and robot costs? How much is the fixed investment cost of the TB robot?