



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_50911
Title of the Manuscript:	Doctors' knowledge on radiation exposure during CT scan prescriptions in Hassan II Hospital of Agadir-Morocco
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The paper suffers from many errors and deficiencies. To help authors improve the paper, most of them are listed below. The major limitation is the restriction to one (reputed) central hospital only. Attempts should be made to discuss the situation in Morocco or at least with regard to potential differences between urban and rural regions.</p> <p>The title is erroneous both with regard to content and grammar. It should be changed to "Physician's knowledge on X-ray exposure from CT scans in a Moroccan hospital" Comment: The specification of the hospital (name and city) should be included in the text.</p> <p>The keywords are inadequate. Terms that are already used in the title should not be repeated.</p> <p>The sentence should be corrected "Every day in each hospital, Physicians use various X-rays technologies to screen diagnose, stage and treat cancers with the aim of saving thousands of lives" to "Every day in each hospital, physicians use various X-ray technologies to screen diagnose, stage and treat cancers with the aim of saving lives" Comment: Apart from grammar, authors do not refer to any study investigating the dedicated number of saved lives.</p> <p>The sentence is erroneous "The biological effects of low doses received during medical diagnostic..." Comment: An exposure of many mSv which exceeds the general population's limit by far cannot be considered to be "low", in particular not in this kind of paper!</p> <p>To comply with the cited literature in the sentence "In any diagnostic procedure the dose of radiation delivered should be ^{7,8} enough to ...", it should be written "... just enough to ...".</p> <p>The questionnaire (and probably the education of doctors) is inadequate since the request is missing of preferred use of alternative, less harmful diagnostic methods such as MRI or ultrasound.</p> <p>For the benefit of readers, the expected correct answers to the questionnaire should be included.</p> <p>The sentence is erroneous "The concerned population included the prescribers ..." Comment 1: That the involved population is already concerned is in contradiction to the published results. Comment 2: Probably authors mean "the investigated population".</p> <p>The given result is erroneous "The average professional experience for all participants was 10,29 ± 6,83 years with 58% of them having more than 10 years of experience." Comment 1: The average value is erroneous. It is in obvious contradiction to the fact that more than 50% have experience beyond the average value – see the definition of an average value! Comment 2: Authors have erroneously calculated mean values (which is allowed at normal distributed data only!). Comment 3: In case of non-normal distributed data, medians (and interquartiles) should be given. Comment 4: In addition, the numbers are either erroneous or written in a wrong way.</p> <p>The sentence is erroneous "... they always take into account the benefit /risk ratio of X-rays when prescribing a scanner, while 54% ..." Comment physicians prescribe CT scans rather than a specific scanner device type.</p>	<p>Thank you for your constructive comments that will be taken into account to improve this manuscript. I inform you that this work is the continuation of another that we carried out on several hospitals in Morocco.</p> <p>We agree with your proposal to change the title of the manuscript, as follows: Physician's knowledge on X-ray exposure from CT scans in a Moroccan hospital</p> <p>Keywords are changed to: CT scan examinations; Patients' radiation protection; X-ray risks.</p> <p>Your proposal has been taken into account for the change of the sentence. The reference has been added.</p> <p>We have changed this sentence to: Biological effects resulting from the accumulation of low doses received during repetitive diagnostic medicals imaging could be harmful.</p> <p>your remark has been taken into account.</p> <p>The purpose of this work was to assess physicians' knowledge of X-ray exposure during CT examinations. We forgot to take into account the non-irradiating imaging modalities (MRI, echography) in the questionnaire. I agree with you, the introduction of some questions regarding these modalities could improve this work.</p> <p>We agree with you to replace the population investigated in the place of the population concerned.</p> <p>By mistake we wrote 10,29 ± 6,83 years instead of 10,29 ± 0,83 years.</p> <p>We agree with you, the word "always" must be deleted from the sentence.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The discussion should be improved by discussion potential limitations due to the reply rate, unfrank answers and restriction to one (reputed) centre hospital. It should aim at extrapolating the results to the overall region or discuss potential differences in other regions, in particular at rural hospitals.</p> <p>The conclusion is inadequate. Instead of the 3rd repetition of detailed results, conclusions should take an overall view and concentrate on identified structural deficits and recommend mandatory and voluntary measures in education and hospital (quality) management.</p> <p>The legends to the figures are misleading and do not comply with the given answers in the diagrams. Comment: The underlying question should be explicitly mentioned.</p>	<p>In Morocco, our experience in this field is very limited. For this reason we have chosen to discuss these results with those of the international literature.</p> <p>We agree with your opinion on the drafting of the conclusion. The reformulation has been done.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Throughout the paper at the beginning of a sentence numbers should be written in words rather than in figures.</p> <p>Throughout the paper (including the title) there is a disturbing misuse of apostrophes such as “doctors” instead of doctor’s or “Physician’ knowledge” instead of “physician’s knowledge” etc.</p> <p>Throughout the paper there is an erroneous use of capital letters.</p> <p>Throughout the paper, the use of “N°” should be avoided such as in “Figure N°1”. It just should be written “Figure 1)</p> <p>At some places words are erroneously written in bold letters.</p> <p>In the sentence “Moreover, it should be and as low ...” the “and” should be deleted.</p>	<p>Note taken into account.</p> <p>Note taken into account.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Note taken into account</p> <p>-</p> <p>Note taken into account</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The declaration regarding conflicts of interest is missing</p>	<p>We just added it, we forgot it.</p>

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	