



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_53997
Title of the Manuscript:	Abdominal CT Dose Examination for Adult Patient in Abuja and Keffi, Hospitals in Nigerian
Type of the Article	Original Research 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		
Introduction	In the last two sentences of the introduction the authors discussed about paediatrics but, the study is on adults. The last paragraph of the introduction should clearly explain the statement of research problem, significance and the main aim of the study.	
Materials and Methods	Explain the sampling method used at arriving different sample size from the 3 centers. Explained how the sample size of 45 was obtained. State the dates when the CT scanners were calibrated by (NNRA). Was there any evidence of quality control tests on CT dosimetry for the CT scanners? The section is too scanty a lot needs to be done.	
Discussion	Compare the findings of the study with the findings of previous published research works. Many studies have been published in the related area. Where there is disagreement between the findings of the study and previous published works, state the possible reasons of the disagreement and where there is agreement also state the possible reasons of the agreement. Discuss the implications of the findings of the current study in details. Are not in accordance with Vancouver style of referencing. The authors should revised the guidelines and rewrite appropriately.	
References		
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Sidi
Department, University & Country	Nigeria