

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_116254</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Radioprotection compliance rules study in Dakar's hospitals (Senegal)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>The study is important because it describes the possible sources of ionizing radiation in a certain geographic area, however it is not determining or does not express anything new, I suggest giving it a focus on health policies and what the scope of your study would be, regarding this.</b></p> <p><b>Appropriate title, only supports the normative part in the introduction, to have greater congruence.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Lack of methodological congruence, however it is feasible to be adequate.</b></p> <p><b>The article is only supported by 10 references, due to the topic where there is great acrimony, I suggest increasing the number of references that allows you to make a better justification and scope of the proposed objective.</b></p> <p>Because you are describing the characteristics in your radiodiagnosis departments in a specific place, it would be important for you to make known what these protection measures are in that place or if they are supported at an international level, mention the document where they are regulated.</p> <p>Materials and methods You write "This is a mixed cross-sectional study combining two quantitative and qualitative approaches", I suggest you write what your variables are that you determine as qualitative and quantitative, since the qualitative scope is not reflected in your results. It is not methodologically based on any of the qualitative proposals such as the phenomenological method or the models that support this type of research. (I suggest clarifying why you take your study as mixed).</p> <p>Please clarify how you carried out the sampling and determination of the sample for the selection of the 8 radiodiagnostic centers. In data collection, it mentions the use of a questionnaire, which describes the total number of items contained and how many and what percentage corresponds to the acquisition of the elements or variables studied.</p> <p>In the analysis of your data, you only mention the statistical program, the actual analysis is not mentioned, since you talk about a mixed study, how you analyzed the qualitative variables and the quantitative variables.</p> <p>I suggest placing the legal ethical section</p> <p>Discussion and results In its results and discussion, it is based on the contents and quantitative methodology but not on a qualitative discussion, so again the scope for taking it as a qualitative study remains in doubt.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>yes</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vicente Beltrán Campos</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Guanajuato, México</b>