



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_46984
Title of the Manuscript:	Sonographic features predictive of thyroid nodule malignancy in a Nigerian Population
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>Sonographic features predictive of thyroid nodule malignancy in a Nigerian Population</p> <p>Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Study design: is it necessary to mention cross sectional if it is a prospective observational study 2. To add references in an uniform format 3. FNA performed using biopsy technique?,, supposed to be FNAC 4. In tableII and III, at few places capital letters are mentioned- eg- YES/NO 5. Is neck xray/irradiation same as mentioned in table 2 6. This may be related to relatively small sample size in this study???- number of females are more 97 when compared to males 13 – can this be quoted 7. Histology compared to cytology? do they mean core biopsy for tissue diagnosis 8. To mention references in an order and to hyperlink with bibliography. 9. To correct the grammatical aspect at few places <p>The concept of this study was good in a selected population but it needs revision like mentioned and relevant statistical analysis can be highlighted in the table. Discussion and results part where statistics has been involved can be more explanatory</p>	<p>Cross sectional has been removed from the revised manuscript</p> <p>References are now added in a uniform format</p> <p>Correction to this has been effected</p> <p>Correction to this has also been effected in the revised manuscript</p> <p>Irradiation has been deleted in the revised manuscript</p> <p>Yes, it can be quoted because generally, thyroid nodules are found to be common in women than in men (references to this assertion are given in the revised manuscript)</p> <p>Histology was meant in the study and not core biopsy which will involve pathological examination of the entire thyroid gland following surgery</p> <p>This has been taken good care of the revised manuscript</p> <p>This point is noted</p> <p>These also are being addressed in the revised manuscript</p>
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Ethical approval was given by the institution where the study was conducted.