



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>Cancer Risk to Paediatric Patients Undergoing CT Examination at the Obafemi Awolowo University Teaching Hospital Complex, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. It was a pleasure for me to check this paper. I read through this manuscript and I think that this is a good paper. Consequently, I congratulate the authors.</p> <p>I suggest that, please, the authors check the following minor comments:</p> <p>-Study design Was it a prospective or retrospective study?</p> <p>It seems to be a retrospective study. Author should comment more thoroughly on the disadvantages of this design (retrospective study), which is often subject to biases (errors that affect the observations of an investigation); for example, in the collection of data, since it greatly limits the validity of the results.</p> <p>-Discussion: The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p> <p>-Conclusion: The Conclusion (of the study) is always stronger if it does not include references.</p> <p>-Keywords: For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)</p>	The corrections have effected along with the suggestion from other reviewers.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	