



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1	Replace review article with original research article	
9-23	Structured the abstract under the following subheadings; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background 2. Objective 3. Materials and Methods 4. Results 5. Conclusion 	
29-48	Merge the paragraphs to two two paragraphs The concept of dose associated with CT examination should be well explained The important of doctors having good knowledge of ionizing radiation should be well explained. The implication of not having the knowledge should also be well explained. The significance of the study should be well explained before stating the study aim	
56-73	There is no point of explaining the different sections of the questionnaire in the section of materials and methods, the questionnaire should be attached to the as an appendix. The study design, sampling method and how the sample size was determine should all be explained in this section' The author should explain clearly how the reliability and validity of the questionnaire were tested. The statistical tools used in data analysis should be clearly explained.	
75-81	The study population should be in the section of materials and methods not in the results section.	
128-167	The discussion should be in paragraph not in bullet and should be in-line with objectives. The authors compared the findings of current study with the previous published works. But there is recently published work related to the study; titled "How Knowledgeable are Non-Radiology Doctors on Ionizing Radiation"	
168-183	Summarize the conclusion to two sentences and values should be removed from the conclusion section.	
185-235	The authors should revised Vancouver style of referencing and rewrite appropriately.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mohammed Sidi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Bayero University Kano, Nigeria</i>