



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>)

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	"For example, a best estimate of the lifetime cancer mortality risk attributable to the radiation exposure from a single abdominal CT examination in 375 in 1,000 while 70 in 1,000 for head CT examination, instead of 1 in 550 and 1 in 1,500 respectively obtained by Brenner et al.[13] as shown in Figures 2 and 4." It looks like cancer mortality risk is 37,5% for abdominal CT Scan and 7% for head CT Scan, inexplicably much larger than the data obtained by Brenner et al.: abdominal CT Scan 37,5% vs. 0,18%, 208 times higher; head CT Scan 7% vs. 0,06% 108 times higher.	All the corrections has been effected
Minor REVISION comments	Table 1 and table 2 are the same. Figures 2 and 3: what means the colored legend and its numbers? Digestive, leukemia and lung have the risk for each color, is it correct?	The correct table two has been effected it was error of cut and paste when I was doing the formatting in line with this journal specification.
Optional/General comments	There is no discussion to explain the data obtained in this paper. In my opinion, there is at least one unexpected error to achieve these high attributable risks. As a non-native English speaker, the language does not sound good. Many sentences were so difficult to understand, few sentences were impossible to understand their meaning.	I have read through and the some sentences have been corrected.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> In this paper, the attributable cancer mortality risk is 37,5% for abdominal CT Scan and 7% for head CT Scan, inexplicably much larger than the data obtained by Brenner et al.: abdominal CT Scan 37,5% vs. 0,18%, 208 times higher; head CT Scan 7% vs. 0,06% 108 times higher. It would not be acceptable to perform any CT scan in children until an error of data collection or calculation is identified.	The necessary corrections have been effected.