



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_48074 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Cancer Risk to Paediatric Patients Undergoing CT Examination at the Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospital Complex, Ile-Ife, Nigeria |
| Type of the Article | |

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>(i) The methodology described under the abstract section for determination of cancer risk was different from actual method (Line 47 downwards) used to estimate cancer risk.</p> <p>(ii) Cancer Risk is best determined from the effective dose, which is the summation of equivalent dose to weighted tissues or organs. In this study, the equation (2) did not reflect the definition of effective dose defined in Line 62-63)</p> <p>(iii) Radiation dose to various tissues or organs are used to estimate effective dose and not for estimating Cancer risk as was used in this study (Line 67-76).</p> <p>(iv) Line 34-35: There is an existing study conducted in Nigeria by Atalabi et al in 2015 on estimation of cancer risk associated with Pediatric cranial CT. The Authors should kindly consult this publication as it will enrich their methodology.</p> <p>(v) The method used in this study to determine cancer risk is not too clear. Tables 1-3 are not clearly presented as you cannot determine effective dose from a single organ dose or determine effective dose for a single organ as it is presented in these tables.</p> <p>(vi) The equation used to determine cancer risk should be stated by the Authors.</p> <p>(vii) The Authors should state the range of exposure factors that gave these higher risks as concluded in this study.</p> <p>(viii) The Author stated that this work was carried out between 2011 and 2012, are these facilities in use at the centre or have been replaced?</p> | <p>(i) The abstract has been corrected to march the methodology used. Sorry for the confusion and thank you for the useful correction</p> <p>(ii) For adult effective is the best but for paediatric it needs adjustment and it has been made.The equation has been corrected see reference 13.</p> <p>(iii) The radiation dose to various tissues or organs were used to estimate effective dose as presented in table 1-3. Brenner et al (2002) took all these into consideration and the same was used in this work.</p> <p>(iv) This work was compared with that of Brenner et al. Estimated Risks of Radiation-Induced Fatal Cancer from Pediatric CT, AJR 2001; 176; 289-296. I have study Atalabi et al work too.</p> <p>(v) It has been effected.</p> <p>(vi) It has been stated.</p> <p>(vii) It has been stated.</p> <p>(viii) No, the facilities have not changed.</p> <p>(ix)</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>There are typographical errors for revisions These include:</p> <p>Under abstract: Line 1 should read " ...research work is to ..." Line 5 should read "...extending their ..."</p> <p>Under study design: Replace: "implications of the x-rays the pediatric patients were exposed to..." with "implications of radiation dose that the pediatric patients were ..."</p> <p>Line 27: the cells affected by larger doses of radiation cannot repair themselves but experienced cell death.</p> <p>Line 91 "Similarly dose other ..." needs to be rephrased.</p> <p>Line 109: It is the duration of the whole study that lasted for one year (not one years) and not that the patients were scanned for a period of one year.</p> <p>Line 159- 160: The Author should explain this significance.</p> <p>Line 162" should read "From"</p> <p>Table 1 and 2 are similar. They represent the same thing.</p> <p>The Author should show in a Table the data that generated fig 1 and 2</p> <p>Line 203: should read "... got..."</p> <p>Reference no 19 and 20 are similar.</p> | <p>Everything has been effected in line with the suggestions.</p> |
| Optional/General comments | | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

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> |
|--|---|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u> | There is no ethical issues with this work because the hospital gave us permission and the patients gave their concents. |