

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)	<p>The Manuscript is important for scientific community since it develops a topic of discussion among numerous professional especially the advertent between traditional Vs the recent advancement in technology.</p> <p>The title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript need to rechecked and organized well, especially the presentation of methodology (the criteria). The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some modification needs to be done especially the grammatical and sentence structure to present the idea. The comment and changes have been made and added to the manuscript. Also, few of the figures need some explanation. The presentation on methodology especially the exclusion and inclusion need to addressed well.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the idea on defending the benefits of CTU over IVU has been presented well with good statistical report and data. Changes that need to be done has been commented.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nima Zangmo
Department, University & Country	Jigme Dorji Wangchuk National Referral Hospital, Bhutan