

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences	
	Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_49869	
	Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Quality of Plain Postero-Anterior Chest Radiographs Seen in a North-West Nigerian Tertiary Hospital	
	Type of the Article	Original Research Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

al



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed highlight that part in the manu his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	 (1). Please make revision, correct and complete punctuations. (2). Move the ethical approval from UDUTH, to the end of the text, below the conclusion and above references. (3). Kindly number the sections of the article sequentially. Do not use chapters as you did in section 5, Discussion. Please note that "The text, excluding the abstract, if required, can be divided into numbered sections with brief headings. Starting from introduction with section 1. subsections should be numbered (for example 2.1 (then 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, etc.), up to three levels". (4). In the text, indicate your citations with reference numbers appearing in normal numerals, preferably enclosed in a bracket [], and not names of authors and year of publications. The references should be numbered serially, according to the sequence of the citations. See the authors' guidelines for an "Eg of a reference to a journal, for published paper: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98". Please refer to the paper template or authors guidelines at www.sciencedomain.org/journal/23/ authors-instruction, for further clarifications. 	
Optional/General comments See manuscript Red highlights signifies: delete / make corrections Green highlights signifies: add / guide to correction	Nice scholarly article. Well written and well presented in good and simple English. Abstract, introduction, material and methods, as well as discussions, were properly articulated and well written. The results were well presented, and reflected the true explanations of the tables and figures. Tables and figures were also self explanatory.	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agreed wit that part in the manuscript. It is m feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umezurik	e Benedict Chidozie
Department, University & Co	untry Governme	ent House Clinic, Nigeria

ed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight mandatory that authors should write his/her