

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_105007
Title of the Manuscript:	Slice Thickness Variation Analysis to Spatial Resolution of CT-Scan Device Image at the Radiology Installation of Bali Mandara Hospital
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	[1] The manuscript is of relevance to medical radiodiagnosis, especially for radiology professionals who are responsible for obtaining images and based on this study can optimize CT protocols according to the slice thickness, taking into account image quality and lower dose to the patient. [2] The Title is brief and enlightening, I suggest a verb at the beginning like: Experimental evaluation and specify the anatomical region of the study. [3] The abstract describes well the objective, methodology and results. [4] The parts of the manuscript are in agreement with the results, which proved to be easy to read. [5] In general, the parts of the manuscript are in accordance with scientific rigor. [6] The references are in accordance with the methodological proposal of an experimental study.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The technical language of the manuscript is clear, and the tables and figures better elucidate the text.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript reinforces the importance of the culture of radiological protection, the experimental study meets the principle of optimization and the relationship between dose and image quality.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Thiago Victorino Claus</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Franciscan University, Brazil</b>