

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_100151
Title of the Manuscript:	DEMOGRAPHIC, CLINICAL AND RADIOLOGICAL FINDINGS AMONG PATIENTS WITH CTU DETECTED UROLITHIASIS IN A TERTIARY 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://journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. YES the manuscript is much needed for the scientific community because the way author written this article is simply amazing and the way author discussed also towards the point. 2. YES I'm accepting the title is completely relevant towards the study 3. The way here author made this abstract is highly impressive and neatly written in simple language where everyone can easily understood. 4. Yes they're accurate from my point of view 5. Yes I'm pretty much sure that the written manuscript is scientifically correct 6. Yes the amount of reference quoted in this manuscript is matching with the current trends in research <p>Here the Overall study period is actually 24months but the reported cases are less than 150 & really a kind of shock.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	YES the language is highly appreciable and author did his/her part best.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Author did his/her part nice and their calculations too significant and once it gets published, I'm damn sure this paper will receive much citation from researchers.	

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:	Boopathi Raja M
Department, University & Country	The Erode College of Pharmacy, India