

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_98848
Title of the Manuscript:	PATTERNS OF COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY UROGRAPHY FINDINGS IN RADIOLOGY DEPARTMENT OF A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN RIVERS STATE: 2 YEARS RETROSPECTIVE STUDY.
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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This research paper is important as it explains the importance of requesting a CT scan of the urinary system based on the importance of the desired results from the examination and measuring the benefit and risk. 2. No , modify to (PATTERNS OF COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY UROGRAPHY FINDINGS IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL IN RIVERS STATE: A TWO-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE STUDY). 3. Not, include the CTU procedure technique as a simply note. 4. Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. Yes 6. The references are not sufficient and are not recent, especially in discussions.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. No , please revise well grammar and sentences.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Magdy Ali Abdou Gouda
Department, University & Country	Pharos University in Alexandria, Egypt