



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	<p>"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."</p> <p>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.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Table 1 and table 2 are the same.</p> <p>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?</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>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.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonas Lenzi De Araujo
Department, University & Country	Brazil