

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_100151</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DEMOGRAPHIC, CLINICAL AND RADIOLOGICAL FINDINGS AMONG PATIENTS WITH CTU DETECTED UROLITHIASIS IN A TERTIARY 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://journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Unfortunately, the manuscript is not important for the international scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The authors have submitted a manuscript entitled "DEMOGRAPHIC, CLINICAL AND RADIOLOGICAL FINDINGS AMONG PATIENTS WITH CTU DETECTED UROLITHIASIS IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL". It is a retrospective evaluation of their patients presenting undergoing a contrast enhanced CT scan for urinary stones. Unfortunately, the indication for performing a CT has not been reported. Contrary to the authors' opinion, contrast enhanced CT is not the standard procedure for urinary stones. The standard procedure is unenhanced CT. Only if certain interventions are planned, we use an contrast enhanced CT scan. I have a problem with a Hounsfield unit of 9698.71. This is extremely high and I believe that that was not a stone (may be metal?)</p> <p>T</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Walter Ludwig Strohmaier</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Split, Croatia, University of Würzburg, Germany</b>