

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_105007</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Slice Thickness Variation Analysis to Spatial Resolution of CT-Scan Device Image at the Radiology Installation of Bali Mandara Hospital</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>I think that the results quoted in the present work are rather well known and do not include any novelty in the field. Therefore, I think that the importance for the scientific community is reduced.</p> <p>I do not understand the title. I think that something like "Effect of the slice thickness on the spatial resolution ..." should be more clear.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive enough though it is focussed on results that do not take into account uncertainties and, as a consequence, are meaningless.</p> <p>Organization of the manuscript is correct, though some details lacks (see comments below).</p> <p>As indicated below, there are several drawbacks that compromise the scientific correctness of the manuscript.</p> <p>The most modern reference dates back to 2017: more recent bibliography lacks. On the other hand, works with results similar to those found here should be included and used for comparison (see comments below)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>English is ok.</p> <p>Other minor points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript does not include page and line numbers and this make very difficult the writing of the review report.</li> <li>2. What means "Nilai" in the y-labels of figures 1 and 2?</li> <li>3. Sections with a single sentence should be unified.</li> <li>4. Section 2.3. starts with 2.3 (repeated).</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>As mentioned above, there are several drawbacks that make the results cited in this manuscript questionable. I list them below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The authors mention that the spatial resolution depends on several magnitudes: kV, mAs, radiation dose, pixel size, filter reconstruction, and slice thickness. In this work the attention is focused exclusively on the latter and the authors only mention the values fixed for the first two (kV and mAs). The possible correlation between all these magnitudes are ignored and, as a consequence, the relevance of the results obtained is compromised.</li> <li>2. This is an experimental work and the corresponding results suffer from uncertainties that must be given in order that the comparisons between them are meaningful. The authors ignore these uncertainties, the result quoted in the present work do not include these uncertainties and, as a consequence, any comparison is meaningless.</li> <li>3. Figures repeat the information in tables: why?</li> <li>4. A serious discussion of the results obtained in comparison to those quoted in previous works by other authors lacks. Only after this comparison is carried out the results shown in the present work could be meaningful.</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Antonio M. Lallena</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad de Granada, Spain</b>