

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_103592
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the influence on the use of additional filtration in pelvic radiographic examinations using a phantom object
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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>Add following references</p> <p>Al-Murshedi S, Ali AM. Influence of additional filters on radiation dose during chest radiography. Journal of Kufa-Physics. 2022;14(02):47-52.</p> <p>Schüle S, Gärtner K, Halt D, Beer M, Hackenbroch C. Low-Dose CT Imaging of the Pelvis in Follow-up Examinations—Significant Dose Reduction and Impact of Tin Filtration: Evaluation by Phantom Studies and First Systematic Retrospective Patient Analyses. Investigative Radiology. 2022 Dec 28;57(12):789-801.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>RE-WRITE THE CONCLUSION PART OMIT NUMBERS OF RESULTS OF THE STUDY USE ONLY WORDS / TEXT TO EXPRESS CONCLUSION IN TERMS OF THE WRITING, FROM AUTHOR'S HEART CRY DEDUCED AFTER CONDUCTING THIS STUDY, NUMBERS NOT NEEDED.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>PLAIN WORDS FORM CONCLUSION, NOT NUMBERS, IN MOST OF THE TIMES IS THE NEEDED ONE IN MANUSCRIPT.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. Sathish Valavan
Department, University & Country	The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, India