

**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**

	<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>
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Importance to the Scientific Community</b></p> <p>This manuscript addresses a critical and under-researched issue regarding the adherence to radioprotection standards in Dakar's hospital radiology departments. Given the potential health risks associated with ionizing radiation, such as cancer and genetic mutations, this research is highly relevant not only for improving patient safety but also for enhancing the occupational safety of health workers in these facilities.</p> <p><b>Title Suitability</b></p> <p>The title of the article is generally clear and reflects the content of the manuscript. However, to enhance clarity and impact, it could be slightly revised to: "Compliance with Radioprotection Rules in Dakar's Hospitals: A Cross-Sectional Study." This alternative title offers a clearer indication of the study design (cross-sectional) and focuses on compliance, aligning closely with the article's main themes.</p> <p><b>Abstract Comprehensiveness</b></p> <p>The abstract succinctly outlines the study's objectives, methods, and a brief on findings, which is appropriate for giving readers an initial overview. However, it would benefit from including specific key results and conclusions to better summarize the impact of the findings. Adding sentences that reflect the main quantitative outcomes and recommendations would enhance its utility as a standalone summary.</p> <p><b>Subsections and Structure</b></p> <p>The manuscript is structured logically with clear subsections that guide the reader through the study's methodology, results, and discussion effectively. The inclusion of specific subsections for data collection and analysis, administrative measures, and protective means offers detailed insights into various aspects of radioprotection in the studied hospitals.</p> <p><b>Scientific Correctness</b></p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate, discussing the implications of radioprotection with appropriate technical depth. The results are presented in a clear manner, and the discussion contextualizes these findings within the broader literature, indicating a sound scientific approach. However, it would benefit from a deeper statistical analysis to strengthen the conclusions drawn.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>The references are relevant and fairly recent, covering a range of studies that provide a comparative perspective on radioprotection in various contexts. However, the manuscript could be enriched by including more recent global literature on radioprotection standards and compliance, possibly including guidelines from international bodies like the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or the World Health Organization (WHO) to provide a benchmark for the observed practices.</p> <p><b>Additional Suggestions</b></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	<p>Data Presentation: Enhance the presentation of statistical data with more detailed analysis and perhaps graphical representations to make the findings more accessible and compelling.</p> <p>Radiation Dosage: Consider including a section that discusses the actual radiation doses received by patients and workers, comparing these to international safety standards.</p> <p>Patient Consent and Ethics: More information on ethical considerations, including patient consent for radiological procedures, could be discussed to align with international research standards.</p> <p>Language and Grammar: The manuscript could benefit from proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve the flow of information, ensuring it meets the professional standards of an international audience.</p> <p>Implementation of Recommendations: It would be beneficial to discuss potential strategies or ongoing efforts within the hospitals studied to improve compliance with radioprotection measures, offering a more proactive perspective on solving the identified issues.</p>	
--	---	--

## Review Form 1.7

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally adequate for scholarly communication but could benefit significantly from improvements to meet the high standards typically expected in peer-reviewed academic publications. There are several areas where the language could be enhanced:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Clarity and Precision</b>: Some sentences are overly complex or awkwardly constructed, which could potentially confuse the reader. Simplifying these sentences and using more precise terminology would improve clarity.</li><li>2. <b>Grammar and Syntax</b>: There are occasional grammatical errors and instances of incorrect syntax that need to be addressed. Correcting these would not only improve readability but also the professional quality of the manuscript.</li><li>3. <b>Technical Language</b>: The manuscript sometimes lacks the specificity and technical detail expected in scholarly articles, especially in descriptions of methodologies and results. Increasing the use of specific technical terms and providing more detailed explanations would strengthen the academic tone.</li><li>4. <b>Consistency</b>: Ensuring consistency in terminology, especially terms related to radiological practices and measurements, is crucial. Consistent use of technical terms adds to the credibility and readability of the manuscript.</li><li>5. <b>Editing and Proofreading</b>: A thorough editing and proofreading process by a native English speaker or a professional with expertise in medical and scientific communications could greatly enhance the manuscript's quality. This process would help in refining the language, ensuring it aligns with the nuances of scholarly communication.</li></ol> <p>Improving these aspects of language and presentation would make the manuscript more suitable for publication in a high-impact academic journal, facilitating better understanding and dissemination of the research findings within the scientific community.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Justification for the score:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>Relevance and Importance</b>: The manuscript addresses a critical and highly relevant topic in the field of radioprotection in healthcare settings, which is a significant area of concern for patient and staff safety. This relevance is crucial for the scientific community and public health.</li><li>- <b>Methodology</b>: The study appears to employ a robust methodological approach, using both qualitative and quantitative measures, which is appropriate for the scope of the research. However, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed explanation and justification of the methodologies used, especially in terms of sample selection and data analysis.</li><li>- <b>Results and Discussion</b>: The results are presented clearly, but the discussion could be expanded to better connect the findings with broader implications and existing literature. This would help in positioning the study within the larger context of radioprotection research.</li><li>- <b>Language and Presentation</b>: The manuscript requires improvements in language clarity and precision. It contains grammatical and syntactic errors that need correction to meet the standards of high-impact academic journals.</li><li>- <b>Ethical Considerations</b>: The manuscript lacks explicit details on ethical considerations such as informed consent and ethical approval, which are essential components of research involving human subjects.</li><li>- <b>References</b>: While the manuscript includes a decent range of references, updating and expanding this list with more recent and relevant literature could strengthen the background and</li></ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>discussion sections.</p> <p><b>**Recommendations for Revision**:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Improve the clarity and precision of the language used throughout the manuscript.</li><li>2. Provide a more detailed description of the methodology and statistical analysis.</li><li>3. Expand the discussion to better link the findings with existing research and potential practical applications.</li><li>4. Address all ethical considerations explicitly, ensuring that all necessary approvals and consent procedures are clearly documented.</li><li>5. Update and expand the reference list to include recent studies and relevant international guidelines on radioprotection.</li></ol> <p>This score indicates that the manuscript has a strong foundation but requires significant revisions to address the mentioned deficiencies before it is suitable for publication. These changes would likely enhance the manuscript's impact and ensure it meets the rigorous standards of a scholarly journal.</p>	
--	---	--

**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>Yanqi Zong</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Graduate and Professional Studies, Trine University, United States</b>